



# **Fairfax County Transportation Plan Update**

## **Public Input and Responses Report**

**April 2006**



Fairfax County Department of Transportation  
12055 Government Center Parkway  
Fairfax, VA 22035

## Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of Public Input.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Acronyms.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1 Transit .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.1 HOV/HOT Facilities .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.2 Rail Extension.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.2.1 I-66 Rail Extension.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.2.2 Dulles Corridor Rail .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.2.3 Light Rail and Others.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.3 Access to Rail Stations.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.4 Virginia Rail Express.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.5 Park-and-Ride .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2 Non-Motorized Transportation .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.1 General Policy Issues .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.2 Suggestions from County Trails and Sidewalks Committee.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2.3 Project Proposals .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3 Specific Road and Bridge Projects .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.1 Bridges .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.2 Centreville Road.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.3 Dulles Corridor .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.4 Elm Place and Morgan Lane .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.5 Greensboro Extension .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>3.6 Gunston Cove Road .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3.7 Hooes Road .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.8 Hunter Mill Road .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>3.8.1 Road and Bridge Improvement Suggestions .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>3.8.2 Character of Hunter Mill Road .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>3.8.3 Traffic Operations (Hunter Mill Road) .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.9 I-66.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>3.10 I-95.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3.11 I-495.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3.12 Lee Chapel Road .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3.13 Little River Turnpike .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>3.14 Lorton Road .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.15 McLearen Road Extension.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>3.16 Mount Vernon Roads.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>3.17 Old Mill Road.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.18 Pohick Road.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>3.19 Silverbrook Road .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>3.20 South Van Dorn Street .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>3.21 Western County Roads.....</b>	<b>43</b>

3.22	Wiehle Avenue Extension.....	45
4	Braddock District Task Force.....	46
5	Transportation for Seniors.....	51
6	Environmental Impact.....	52
6.1	Noise .....	52
6.2	Chesapeake Bay Plan.....	52
7	Transportation Demand Management.....	53
8	Traffic Operations.....	55
9	Roadway Functional Classification .....	57
9.1	Specific Changes.....	57
9.2	Local Roads .....	59
09.3	Cut-Through Traffic.....	60
10	ROW Requirement Guidelines .....	61
11	Plan Implementation, Review and Performance.....	62
11.1	Implementation .....	62
11.2	Plan Review .....	63
11.3	Plan Performance Measures .....	64
11.4	2005 Plan Update Process .....	65
12	Outside Scope of Plan Update .....	66
12.1	Bus Service Requests .....	66
12.2	Land Use .....	69
12.3	Housing affordability.....	71
12.4	Traffic data .....	72
13	Appendix 1: Record of Public Suggestions .....	73

## **Introduction**

This Public Input and Response Report contains all the suggestions received from the public during the Transportation Plan Update. Staff responses follow each comment and suggestion. In cases where a number of suggestions were the same, the suggestion is only listed once and the report notes that the suggestion was received from multiple individuals.

Public input was solicited during two phases of this process. First, in December 2004, the Fairfax County Department of Transportation initially announced that the County's Transportation Plan would be updated and that there would be two rounds of public meetings regarding the Transportation Plan Update in 2005, one in the spring and one in the fall. A newsletter was sent out in the fall of 2004 to announce the plan update process with a webpage established to announce the meeting schedule and request public input during the plan process. Printed copies of the newsletter were available at Fairfax County Public Libraries, Supervisor District Offices, the Planning Commission Office and the Department of Transportation. A website for the project was initiated. Citizens were directed to the Transportation Plan Update website to submit their suggestions for the Plan Update. In addition to the online submission form, the public could mail or fax comments to the Fairfax County Department of Transportation office. This comment period remained open until May 31, 2005.

The first round of public meetings was held between March 1 and March 14, 2005. The purpose of these meetings was to provide basic information about the County's Transportation Plan and the Plan Update process that would occur the remainder of the year, and to solicit initial public input. Seven meetings were held and they were distributed geographically around the County. At each meeting citizens and stakeholders signed in and received a packet of information containing a copy of the PowerPoint presentation for the meeting, a Plan Change Suggestion Form, the announcement with all the March public meetings listed, and a Demographic and Transportation Fact Sheet for Fairfax County. Fairfax County Department of Transportation planners and consultants from Cambridge Systematics presented information about the Transportation Plan and the growth projected for the County. Staff members from the Department of Planning and Zoning also attended. The public was encouraged to provide input that would help in the Plan Update project. Each meeting lasted approximately two hours.

A second round of public meetings was held between November 1 and November 10, 2005. The purpose of these meetings was to report on the results of the travel demand forecasting that had been conducted and to solicit additional public input. Again, seven meetings were held and they were distributed geographically around the County. These meetings were announced in late September. The public was again invited to provide input and a comment form was reinstated on the website. This comment period remained open until November 30, 2005.

## **Summary of Public Input**

For the two public suggestion periods described above, all public input submissions received via, mail, facsimile or online through the plan update website were documented and are contained in this report. Petitions from 67 individuals were received regarding Hunter Mill Road and petitions from 74 individuals were received regarding the McLearen Road extension. Several nominations from the 2004 and 2005 Area Plan Review (APR) cycles are also included in this report. The following organizations supplied input: Centreville Citizens for Rail; Dulles Corridor Rail Association, Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce, Hunter Mill Road Traffic Calming Committee, South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee, Dranesville District Supervisor, Mt. Vernon District Supervisor, Fairfax County Commission on Aging and the Mt. Vernon Council.

One theme that was constant during both rounds of public meetings and reflected in the written comments received was a strong desire from County residents for an improved network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Although bicycle and pedestrian facilities are not explicitly shown on the Transportation Plan Map, the recommended policies strengthen the County's commitment to improving this aspect of the transportation system

The purpose of this report is to document all of the suggestions received during the Transportation Plan Update. In order to do this in a digestible form, lengthy suggestions and comments have been condensed. Also, suggestions or comments that contain the same substance have been combined in order to save space. In these cases, there is a note that more than one individual submitted the suggestion or comment. If the suggestion was submitted by an organized group or citizen association, the organization is listed as the submitter. If the suggestion was submitted by an individual, the individual is not listed in this report. Appendix 1 is an index of the suggestions received and lists the zip code of the submitter as well as the mechanism used to submit the comment and the subject of the comment.

There are two principle components of the County's Transportation Plan. One consists of the Transportation Policies and the other is the Transportation Plan Map. Suggestions that reference the specific characteristics of a transportation facility, for instance the number of lanes on a road, pertain to the Transportation Plan Map. The Recommended Transportation Plan Map is also contained in the proposed Plan Amendment. Comments and suggestions received relating to operational or design features of transportation facilities, while not part of the Transportation Plan Update process, were forwarded to the appropriate State or County agencies for review.

## **Acronyms**

BRAC – Base Realignment and Closure

CLRP – Constrained Long Range Plan

CNMTC – County Non-Motorized Transportation Committee (former name of County Trails and Sidewalks Committee)

DPZ – Department of Planning and Zoning

FCDOT - Fairfax County Department of Transportation

HOV- High Occupancy Vehicle

HOT – High Occupancy Toll

LOS – Level of Service

MWCOG – Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (commonly shortened to COG)

ROW – Right-of-Way

SOV – Single Occupancy Vehicle

TAC – Transportation Advisory Commission

TDM – Transportation Demand Management

V/C ratios – Volume-to-Capacity

VMT – Vehicle Miles Traveled

VRE – Virginia Railway Express

VDOT – Virginia Department of Transportation

VDRPT – Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation

## 1 Transit

### 1.1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)/ High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Facilities

**Suggestion:** Widen County Parkway for HOV (carpools, vanpools and buses).  
(ID: 50, SubID: 0050e)

**Response:** The current adopted Transportation Plan recommends High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes for the segment between the Dulles Toll Road and I-66. This Plan Update evaluated the alternative of HOV facilities along the entire Fairfax County Parkway Corridor from Route 7 to the Franconia-Springfield Parkway. As a result of this evaluation, the recommended Plan includes HOV on the Fairfax County Parkway from Route 7 to the Franconia-Springfield Parkway showing 6 lanes in this section.

---

**Suggestion:** Revisit effectiveness of HOV "network". Sociological change and other measures i.e. telecommuting, job dispersion, flexible hours and personal independence all work to make HOV less popular.  
(ID: 102, SubID: 0102b)

**Response:** The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) periodically evaluates the effectiveness of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes in the metropolitan Washington, DC region. MWCOG published a draft of the last such evaluation in September 2005 based on data collected in Spring 2004. This report concludes that "Barrier-separated and exclusive HOV facilities continue to provide substantial savings in travel time" and that "HOV lane person throughput on a per lane per hour basis continues to outperform adjacent non HOV lanes."

It is our conclusion that the HOV network continues to offer the general public one of the significant options available to help reduce SOV travel in the Region. Transit can utilize HOV lanes to enhance operating speed. Efforts to expand other options such as increased transit availability will continue to be considered as well, as part of the overall HOV facility planning effort.

---

**Suggestion:** Improper to characterize HOV as a type of transit as in policy 2B. Where HOV lanes exist, the minimum should be 3-people.  
(ID: 102, SubID: 0102e)

**Response:** The existing County Transportation Plan designates six Enhanced Public Transportation Corridors. It lists HOV as one of the potential improvements that could be implemented in such a corridor. Therefore, by policy HOV use is included under the definition of public transportation in the County Transportation Policy Plan.

The current variations in the minimum HOV riders' requirement reflect differences between the corridors. This policy is periodically re-evaluated by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the local jurisdictions to keep up with changes in travel patterns and demand. The Council of Governments (COG) Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) assumes that all HOV facilities in the region will have a minimum standard of HOV-3 by 2015.

---

**Suggestion:** Propose HOT lanes on I-66 in addition to HOV.  
(ID: 132, SubID: 0132b)

**Response:** The Region is collectively looking into High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes on I-95/395, I-495 and the Dulles Toll Road through public-private partnerships. Being the first initiatives in the DC region, there are major policy and engineering issues to be considered. Key to the development of HOT facilities is to ensure that HOT facilities maintain a satisfactory level of service for HOV users, and allow for sufficient capacity for the SOV users through the mechanism of variable pricing. Upon completion of HOT studies on I-95/395 and I-495, we will be able to get a better understanding of HOT lane operations, which will provide insight in the other major corridors, including I-66. Additionally, in 2004 the General Assembly passed a bill requiring that any study of I-66 evaluate HOT lanes.

---



## **1.2 Rail Extension**

### **1.2.1 I-66 Rail Extension**

**Suggestion:** Would like I-66 rail extension stations shown on map.  
(ID: 132, SubID: 0132a)

**Suggestion:** Land shall be preserved as rights-of-way for the Centreville and Stringfellow Metro Stations and parking.  
(ID: 125, SubID: 0125h)

**Response:** Both the current and the recommended County Transportation Plan Map designate locations for potential parking and station facilities along the I-66 corridor, for which land could be obtained through the development review process. Right of way is already reserved for the future Metro station and related parking and transit facilities at Stringfellow Road. Right of way for parking has also been obtained at Fairfax Corner.

---

### **1.2.2 Dulles Corridor Rail**

**Suggestion:** Must pursue Dulles Rail project with full vigor, avoiding changes and delays. Opponents continue to raise false and misleading charges that must be denied.  
(ID: 135, SubID: 0135a)

**Suggestion:** Metrorail to Dulles Corridor.  
(ID: 50, SubID: 0050a)

**Response:** The County is committed to moving forward with the Dulles Rail project as a top priority. The revised Objective 2 of the recommended Transportation Policies includes a policy to support rail extension in the Dulles Corridor to the Dulles Airport and Loudoun County. Local funding for Phase I of Dulles Rail is in place through the Tax Improvement District.

---

**Suggestion:** Improve access roads to future rail stations including: Wiehle Avenue, Sunrise Valley Road, Sunset Hills Road, and Reston Parkway; Improve roads in station area to make them walkable; Expedite improvements on Rt. 7 and County Parkway; Increase Herndon-Monroe station parking prior to completion; expand gates on Toll Road with additional toll booths and dedicated Smart Tag lanes.  
(ID: 291, SubID: 0291a)

**Response:** The County is proposing to fund a study to evaluate access to the future Wiehle Avenue station. The Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project Environmental

Impact Statement and the Federal Transit Administration Record of Decision identified access improvements for pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles and bus service along access roads such as Wiehle Avenue, Sunrise Valley Road, Sunset Hills Road, and Reston Parkway. Future detailed access planning studies will further expand upon those recommendations.

The Herndon-Monroe Park-and-Ride is planned to be expanded in Phase II of the Dulles Rail Extension. The County is currently evaluating new surface lot and provisions for structure in advance of rail.

VDOT is considering providing smart tag lanes at all toll gates.

---

### 1.2.3 Light Rail and Others

**Suggestion:** Start light rail planning, as found feasible by the million dollar VDRPT study. The Beltway cannot furnish vital transit function, HOT lanes or not. The Northern Virginia 2020 Plan called for Light Rail from Tyson's Corner to Bailey's Crossroads and the Pentagon. Arlington County is working on their segment and Fairfax needs to cooperate. Conversely, the 2020 Plan called for Metrorail to Prince William County. This must be rejected for four reasons: 1) uneconomical and unaffordable, much different from Dulles, 2) VRE serves the area well and could be improved at much less than Metrorail, 3) the chairman of COG that slipped the PW Metrorail extension in without study was defeated for reelection and 4) it might overload Metrorail by putting more economical VRE out of business. (ID: 135, SubID: 0135g)

**Response:** Generally, in terms of capacity, operating speed and cost, light rail is a transit mode that stands between express bus service and heavy rail transit (Metrorail). There are a few corridors in the County that may have the potential for light rail transit. During the review of transit improvements, staff identified four corridors, including Route 1, Route 28, I-495 and Columbia Pike, for light rail transit evaluation through the demand forecasting process. The recommended County Transportation Plan includes light rail on Route 1 as well as the Fairfax county portion of the Columbia Pike light rail/streetcar being planned in Arlington County.

Additionally, mass transit improvements both within the County and beyond the County boundary, are currently being evaluated in the Northern Virginia 2030 Transportation Plan, which includes rail service to Centreville and Potomac Mills and from Tysons Corner to Baileys Crossroads. Information can be obtained at: <http://www.transaction2030.com>.

---

### 1.3 Access to Rail Stations

**Suggestion:** For mixed-use development at Wiehle Avenue Metrorail site, include planning for vehicular, transit, pedestrian and bicycle access to station site.  
(ID: 50, SubID: 0050b)

**Response:** The County is seeking joint development proposals for the Wiehle Avenue Station. The proposals will be reviewed and one selected in 2006, prior to construction of the Wiehle Avenue Station. The Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project Environmental Impact Statement has identified access needs to the Wiehle Station by pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles including buses. Additional access planning will be done during the design of the joint development.

---

**Suggestion:** Access planning for facilities serving four Metrorail Stations in Tyson's, Reston Parkway, Herndon-Monroe and Route 28 opening in Phase 2.  
(ID: 50, SubID: 0050c)

**Response:** The County has initiated a special study of the Tysons Corner Urban Center. As part of this effort, detailed station area studies for the rail stations in Tyson's, to identify potential access improvements to rail stations, will be done. For stations in the Reston-Herndon area, the section of the Reston-Herndon Suburban Center and Transit Station Areas under the Area III Plan provides land use and transportation planning guidelines.

---

**Suggestion:** Off ramp to Nutley/ Vienna Metro south side: make the road leading into the metro from Nutley ONE-WAY going towards the metro up to the train entrance area. In combination with dedicated bus lane, the buses could have access to the Metro ramp and a straight shot to the Metro entrance, and cars coming from Nutley would have to yield to buses.  
(ID: 169, SubID 0169b)

**Response:** The suggestion of a one-way entrance from eastbound I-66 to the south side of the station was considered as an alternative to the station circulation in station area studies. This alternative was rejected for a number of reasons, including increased difficulty for Metro users to circulate between parking facilities and diminished access to Nutley Street.

A direct ramp to and from I-66 West to access the Vienna Station is anticipated for design in the VDOT six-year program. This will provide better bus access to the station, directly from the HOV lanes.

---

**Suggestion:** Provide pedestrians and cyclists safe and attractive access to transit stations and Metrorail stations.  
(ID: 50, SubID 0050g)

**Response:** The proposed revision to the transportation policies emphasizes the importance of non-motorized transportation facilities in the County's transportation system from all aspects. Policy g under Objective 2 specifically addresses providing non-motorized facilities to access transit facilities. This comment has been incorporated in the revised Policy g.

---

**Suggestion:** When the West Falls Church Metrorail Station was built, the proposal to build a pedestrian access to the station from the Reddfield neighborhood was defeated. I think the proposal should be revisited. It can bring in additional ridership and support for the Dulles Rail Plan.  
(ID: 74, SubID: 0074a)

**Response:** This proposal is local and would not appear on the County Transportation Plan Map. It would need to be evaluated for its potential impact on the neighborhood, feasibility for right-of-way and engineering, and cost-effectiveness.

---

**Suggestion:** Proposed I-66 flyover to New Braddock Road shall be contingent upon building the Centreville Metro Station between I-66 and Rt. 29.  
(ID: 125, SubID: 0125d)

**Response:** The Transportation Plan shows a future extension of New Braddock Road to Route 29/Stone Road that will cross I-66 on a bridge. Access to any future rail station is not specified at present and will be subject to future planning for the extension of rail in the I-66 corridor.

---

## 1.4 Virginia Railway Express

**Suggestion:** Help Prince William County and Delegate Mims get VRE extended out to Haymarket. Important to Fairfax County and Town of Vienna, taking 1,800 cars off I-66 in the peak hour/ direction. It will take 900 cars off Route 123, worth another lane on I-66. Fund VRE to Haymarket with private revenue bonds supplemented by Norfolk Southern funds for freight benefits received.  
(ID: 135, SubID: 0135d)

**Response:** The VRE extension is incorporated in the County transportation network modeling and therefore the travel forecast along the I-66 corridor within the County captured the potential ridership on the VRE extension. The Northern Virginia 2030 Transportation Plan is performing an evaluation of the VRE extension to Haymarket, using multi-model corridor level of service measures.

---

## 1.5 Park-and-Ride

**Suggestion:** Expand Herndon-Monroe Park and Ride.  
(ID: 50, SubID: 0050f)

**Response:** Phase II of the Dulles Metrorail Project will expand Herndon-Monroe to approximately 3,500 spaces. The County is currently evaluating a new surface lot and provisions for structure in advance of rail.

---

## 2 Non-Motorized Transportation

### 2.1 General Policy Issues

**Suggestion:** Regular cyclists are disappointed in County's slow response to implementing a trails plan. It is not integrated into the Transportation Plan. The proposed project should be implemented into the Transportation Policy and should have regular communication between FCDOT and Trails Committee.  
(ID: 35, SubID: 0035c)

**Response:** The Trails Plan map will be included in the updated Transportation Policy Plan and a large scale map can be obtained through the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ). This Plan Update emphasizes the importance of integrating non-motorized transportation facilities into the network (Objective 4), financing (Objective 8 Policy e) and design (Appendix on Right-of-Way Requirements) as well as other relevant objectives. Staff has been working with the County Trails and Sidewalks Committee on these policy issues during the Plan Update process.

The revised policies on funding call for increasing funding for non-motorized transportation facilities. In January 2006, the Pedestrian Task Force established by the Board of Supervisors recommended a 10-year \$60 million pedestrian facility capital improvement plan.

---

**Suggestion:** Construct trails to connect neighborhoods, construct bike paths and park authority trails to transportation facilities and historic points of interest, fill in gaps between existing trail networks, add buffers between autos and trails, provide bike lock-up, no-seating metro cars for bikers and wheelchairs, more space on buses (outside) for bikes, maintain pedestrian trails, signage lights and emergency call boxes along trails. Create trails that meet national guidelines and improve existing to meet national requirements.  
(ID: 288, SubID: 0288e)

**Response:** Most of these recommendations are consistent with Board commitments regarding trails and bicycling, but require additional funding to implement. The Comprehensive Plan provides a policy basis for the recommendations. The Pedestrian Task Force Report (Jan. 2006) provides a detailed blueprint of how to implement improvements available at <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/fcdot/pedforce.htm>

---

**Suggestion:** Trails plan and map should be shown in the policy plan. Wants to know where trails are planned and whether or not they are connected to transit, shopping centers and the regional bike network. Would like to know construction plans for them too- all-weather, fair-weather, lighted?  
(ID: 288, SubID: 0288a)

**Response:** The Trails Plan map will be included in the updated Transportation Policy Plan and a large scale map can be obtained through the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ). The County is reviewing cost requirements for producing and printing a bicycle map showing designated routes. It is currently available for download at the website: <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/maps>. The map may be obtained from DPZ or the County's Maps and Publications Center.

---

**Suggestion:** Policies U and X and Objective 4 should explicitly call for integration of the non-motorized trail plan with all other modal systems in the plan.  
(ID: 102, SubID: 0102f)

**Response:** During this Plan Update, the public and the County stressed the importance of non-motorized transportation facilities and the need to include them as part of a multi-modal transportation system. This emphasis has been reflected in the revised policies and appendices.

---

**Suggestion:** Bike lanes need attention in multiple places.  
(ID: 130, SubID: 0130a)

**Response:** Needs for on-road bike lanes have been incorporated in various parts of the revised policies (please refer to the transportation policy document). The revised Right-of-Way Requirements Appendix also reflects multi-use trail and bike lane requirements for right-of-way acquisition on major arterials.

---

**Suggestion:** Focus on integration of pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian use in the Hunter Mill Road Corridor.  
(ID: 289, SubID: 0289c)

**Response:** Communities in the Hunter Mill Corridor may work with the County's Trails and Sidewalks Committee, to plan and support construction of non-motorized transportation facilities along the corridor.

---

**Suggestion:** I am not writing to suggest a change, but rather to commend the County for its emphasis on the use of public transportation and pedestrian-friendly development in high-density areas. In particular, as the Tyson's Corner Urban Center is developed, a significant effort must be made to include pedestrian access, as stated in Objective 11 (d). As someone who currently works in Tyson's Corner, I can say for certain that the arrival of Metro to the area will mean nothing if people are not able to walk to their destination once they exit the transit system. The proposed policies in this area are excellent. I hope the County is able to follow through as development progresses.  
(ID: 312, SubID: 0312a)

**Response:** In 2005 the Board of Supervisors initiated a Special Study for the Tysons Corner Urban Center to address this issue. The Tysons Land Use Task Force (officially named the Tysons Coordinating Committee) will recommend revisions to the County's Comprehensive Plan for Tysons Corner in order for Tysons Corner to change to a more pedestrian-friendly environment when Metrorail serves it.

---



## 2.2 Suggestions from County Trails and Sidewalks Committee

(ID:292; SubID: 0292a, CNMTC)

**Suggestion:** Objective 2 - The goals for use of non-motorized and public transportation should be retained. The County should be able to quantify current use of all modes and report on a regular basis the progress in meeting the stated goals.

**Response:** Proposed Objective 2 has been revised from the current Objective 2 to apply to all travelers, not just commuters. Specific targets have been removed due to the difficulty in measuring these on a regular basis. Quantification of current use of all modes is desirable. However, measuring this on a regular basis is complex and resource intensive.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 4 Policy c - Countdown and audible pedestrian signals should be included in the examples as per CNMTC earlier comment.

**Response:** Proposed policy b (old policy c) lists several pedestrian safety devices, including crosswalks, refuge areas and pedestrian signals.

Countdown and audible signals are types of pedestrian signals. VDOT has adopted the policy in summer 2005 to install countdown signals at new locations where pedestrian signals will be installed and where old signals will be replaced. Issues regarding audible signals, such as technology, cost, noise and maintenance, are still under examination. The transportation policy advocates pedestrian safety devices in a general way. VDOT is testing a pilot program at this point.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 4 Policy d - Agree that this statement is duplicative. Policy f (new policy d) - Strongly agree with this revision to require sidewalks on both sides of streets. "Comment: Per TAC" should include CNMTC comment in support of this revision.

**Response:** Noted

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5 Policy b - TDM strategies listed should also include promotion of bicycling and walking to work and to transit centers, and provision of bicycle facilities at employment locations such as secure bicycle parking, lockers, and shower facilities.

**Response:** Objective 4 Policy c and Objective 2 Policy g advocate walking and biking to transit centers, employment locations and major public facilities. Providing shower facilities should be on a case-by-case basis during the development review process.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5 Policy c. Change "...to encourage transit, high occupancy vehicle usage, and use of non-motorized transportation."

**Response:** Incorporated into the proposed policy.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5 General comment: TDM's that are currently in place are difficult for the County to enforce. I would think that the County should have a policy of monitoring and enforcement of current and future TDM's, but I don't have any proposed language.

**Response:** Objective 14 is about plan review and update. It outlines policies to monitor and evaluate transportation trends. The County has undertaken a TDM study, which considers the specifics of TDM strategies and implementation mechanisms.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 6. Do not agree with the deletion of the text "...and should reflect an overall goal of reducing reliance on the single-occupancy vehicle."

**Response:** One of the overall goals of the Transportation Plan is to reduce reliance on SOV use. The objectives and policies address this from different perspectives. Objective 1 states "reduces SOV use" at the beginning of the Policy Plan; therefore, there is no need to duplicate under Objective 6. Staff recommends deleting this in the text.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 6. The "transportation system" must include non-motorized transportation, which was not always the case in the original plan.

**Response:** The revised plan reflects an increased emphasis on an integrated transportation system, from planning, design, programming, implementation to maintenance. In addition, there are several new policies representing this change.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 6 Policy a - Do not agree with the deletion of this text (...particularly the encouragement of transit-oriented development...). The examples cited are important and are not implied by the text that was not deleted.

**Response:** Staff concurs with the suggestion. These are the important centers or development areas in the County where facility integration should be emphasized.

---

**Suggestion:** Existing Objective 7. CNMTC suggestion for new policy e was not included. While the wording may not be ideal, the negative impact of road projects on non-motorized transportation must be considered: [new] Policy e. Road modifications shall have a positive impact on pedestrians and bicyclists. Crosswalks should be provided at all four road crossings at major intersections.

**Response:** Recommended Policy b under Objective 4 states “Provide for clearly marked pedestrian features, such as sidewalks, trails, crosswalks, refuge areas and pedestrian signals, in the constructions and reconstruction of roads and bridges.” This addresses the suggestion at a policy level. Providing crosswalks at all four crossings of a signalized intersection is consistent with Best Practices. However, due to the variation in site conditions, this should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

---

**Suggestion:** Existing Objective 8 Policy e - This policy should be retained. As stated above, the definition of the “transportation system” in the past has not always included non-motorized transportation. Even if non-motorized transportation is included in the definition, there is still a need to increase funding just for those facilities identified in policy e.

**Response:** Recommended Policy d under Objective 8 is about “increasing funding for trails, sidewalks and on-road bicycle routes”, which addresses the comment above.

---

**Suggestion:** Proposed Objective 9 Policy e - The definition of “unsafe” must include the safety of all transportation users, not just motorists. Correcting unsafe conditions for motorists on existing roadways often results in negative impacts on pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Response:** recommended Policy h under Objective 9 specifically addresses correcting unsafe conditions for pedestrians and users of non-motorized facilities. Policy e is about geometric improvements to roads which should lead to better conditions for all road users. No further changes are recommended.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 10 Policy a - CNMTC comment not included. Maximizing the efficiency of existing roads has caused many of the problems now encountered by pedestrians and cyclists. This maximization must consider the negative impact on non-motorized transportation users. CNMTC comment: “Policy a. Maximize the efficiency of existing roads through low-cost strategies to increase capacity such as channelization, turning lanes, signalization, and signage, while avoiding negative impacts on pedestrians and cyclists.”

**Response:** Policy a has been revised per CNMTC suggestion.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 10 Policy c. comment should include Per CNMTC.

**Response:** Noted

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 10 Policy d - CNMTC comment was to allow non-motorized through travel on local and collector streets. This comment was not included. One of the major impediments to developing an efficient non-motorized transportation system, and one could argue to developing an efficient motorized system, is the lack of connectivity of local and collector streets. The grid system allows a great deal of through traffic which reduces pressure on the major arterials and allows cyclists many alternatives to traveling on the main roads, and yet we continue to encourage the development of this kind of system. We should at least encourage non-motorized through travel on local and collector streets.

**Response:** Recommended policy c under Objective 10 addresses this suggestion: “Promote accessibility between residential developments to facilitate emergency access, local circulation of motorized and non-motorized traffic and potential neighborhood bus service. Policy d is to discourage vehicle through traffic on local and collector streets. These roads, by classification, are to facilitate neighborhood vehicular access to major roads. By discouraging vehicle through traffic, it would improve the environment for non-motorized users.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 11 Policy d - I do not agree with the deletion of the selected text (“The road network...”). The deleted items are important and should be included.

**Response:** Comment is not clear. Staff assumes the comment was to list types of activity centers, which were retained in the revised policy.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 11 - CNMTC comment regarding new policy h was not included. Temporary pedestrian access at construction locations is important and neglected and to my knowledge not addressed by the public facilities manual. This suggested new policy would begin to correct that oversight: [new] Policy h f. Require all new developments and all redevelopment projects to provide temporary pedestrian access where such access is affected by the development.

**Response:** This suggestion has been incorporated into the revised policy f .

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 13 Policy f. Shouldn't we provide non-motorized access to Dulles and especially Reagan National Airport?

**Response:** The County does not have ownership of transportation facilities within airports. Providing bike paths on the highways leading to Dulles Airport and Reagan National Airport may not necessarily facilitate security and internal circulation at the airport. Discussion with the Airport Authority would be needed.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 14. Even though “transportation system” now implies non-motorized transportation, it has not in the past. There has been a lack of integration, funding, and maintenance of non-motorized transportation facilities compared to

motorized facilities. The Trails Plan is currently separate from the “Transportation Plan”, and is not updated on the same schedule. There is almost no mention of non-motorized transportation in Appendices 1, 2, and 3. The CNMTC suggested inclusion of non-motorized transportation facilities and a list of major regional trails, and these appear to have been rejected without comment. These appendices probably need further review to correct that oversight. I think it is important that the need for integration of motorized and non-motorized transportation be stated in the plan, hence the CNMTC policy presented earlier: [new] Policy e h. Ensure integration of the motorized and non-motorized Transportation Plans.

**Response:** Trail system classification is described in the Trails Plan, which is an element of the County Transportation Plan. A trail classification appendix (Appendix 3) is proposed to be added to the revised policy document.

---

## 2.3 Non-Motorized Project Proposals

**Suggestion:** Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to Burke VRE station from communities on the north side of the railroad tracks. Construct overpass over tracks to station, including trail leading from Guinea Road toward tracks, improve Roberts and New Guinea Road for pedestrian and bike access and add pedestrian trail along Guinea between Zion and Falmead Roads.  
(ID: 288, SubID: 0288b)

**Suggestion:** Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to Burke VRE station from communities on the south side of the railroad tracks. Construct all-weather bridge over Sideburn Branch connecting existing Burke Centre Conservancy trail near Walnut Lane to Burke Centre VRE and extend FCPA's trail along Southern Pacific railway, connecting existing trail from historic Burke to VRE.  
(ID: 288, SubID: 0288c)

**Suggestion:** Improve overall pedestrian and bicycle access to Burke VRE. Effective and aesthetically-pleasing buffers between the road and sidewalk, particularly on Roberts Parkway/ Guinea Road intersection and overpass- enhancing safety and more trails use. Improve bike parking, quality of pedestrian walkway surface at VRE, plow sidewalks and access routes, and ensure operable lighting.  
(ID: 288, SubID 0288d)

**Response:** The Braddock District Task Force on the Burke Center VRE Station came up with a unanimous adoption of recommendations for improvements to non-motorized access to the station. These improvements would include a series of trail connections and stream crossings between the VRE station and the communities to the south, and pedestrian improvements at the Burke Center Parkway/Roberts Parkway intersection. The Board of Supervisors approved funding for design of station access improvements to the south side in Fiscal Year 2005 carryover. Several APR items related to access to the north side are currently under consideration.

---

**Suggestion:** In the immediate future, an area that really is crying out for an immediate bike lane/ sidewalk is about 100 yards on Columbia Pike immediately south of Powell Lane. The nice bicycle path just stops and bikers have to ride directly in traffic.  
(ID: 130, SubID: 0130c)

**Response:** The County's Department of Public Works and Environment Services (DPWES) has been trying to secure one easement for this project, but has not been successful yet.

---

**Suggestion:** Make a bike path to Oakton Center - perhaps some children can ride their bikes to school.  
(ID: 227, SubID: 0227c)

**Response:** The location of the bike path in this suggestion is not clear. There is a project to add a trail on the east side of Hunter Mill Road adjacent to the Oakton Shopping Center.

If the "Oakton Center" is assumed to be the Oak Mar Recreation Center, an 8-foot asphalt trail was built along the north side of Jermantown Road connecting sidewalks along Chain Bridge Road and Blake Lane.

---

**Suggestion:** All speed shall be used in building the pedestrian sidewalk north of Route 29 under I-66. The present situation remains dangerous.  
(ID: 125, SubID: 0125g)

**Response:** This project is part of the Board's Four-Year Transportation Program. Design has been completed and construction will be completed in summer 2006.

---

**Suggestion:** Bike routes from Alexandria into Annandale are not well-refined. Some chokepoints are particularly scary, in particular getting over I-395 at either Edsall Road or Little River Turnpike. Put bike lanes on either or both of these roads. An additional / alternate bike path could be at the Montrose Street dead end into Lincolnia Park as a way to cross under I-495 onto the nice bike path along Turkeycock Run and parallel to Winter View Drive.  
(ID: 130, SubID: 0130b)

**Response:** On-road bike routes are planned on Little River Turnpike in the Trails Plan. In addition, off-road major paved trails are planned along Little River Turnpike, Edsall Road and stream valley of Turkeycock Run. A proposed alternate bike path along Montrose Street is not on Trails Plan. Funding is needed to implement trails on the Trails Plan.

---

### 3 Specific Road and Bridge Projects

#### 3.1 Bridges

**Suggestion:** Ensure that vital bridge maintenance projects get attention. Bridges must be protected from already rusted girders, in time weakening them.  
(ID: 135, SubID: 0135b)

**Response:** This comment has been forwarded to VDOT, which is responsible for the maintenance of bridges.

---

#### 3.2 Centreville Road

**Suggestion:** Widen Centreville Road between Metro Tech Drive to McLearen Road to six lanes instead of four at first and then six later. Groundbreaking has already occurred on this project.  
(ID: 15, SubID: 0015a)

**Response:** In the Board of Supervisors' Transportation Plan Four-Year Program, the Board approved construction of a four-lane road within a six-lane right-of-way.

---

**Suggestion:** Build sound wall during Centreville Road widening project to block the noise going to house on Kilbrennan Court.  
(ID 167, SubID 0167a)

**Response:** Sound walls are built where warranted on projects having federal funding; however, this project is not federally funded.

---

**Suggestion:** Do not allow heavy trucks onto Centreville Road. The noise is too much near Kilbrennan Court.  
(ID 167, SubID 0167c)

**Response:** Through Truck Traffic restrictions are handled under a separate process with VDOT.

---

**Suggestion:** Reduce the speed on Centreville Road to discourage speeding close to Kilbrennan Court.  
(ID 167, SubID 0167b)

**Response:** This comment has been forwarded to VDOT, which is responsible for setting speed limits.

---



### 3.3 Dulles Corridor

**Suggestion:** Additional toll booth capacity on Dulles Toll Road, especially EZ pass booths.

(ID: 50, SubID: 0050h)

**Response:** This comment has been forwarded to VDOT, which is responsible for managing the Toll Road.

---

**Suggestion:** Accelerate widening of Route. 7.

(ID: 50, SubID: 0050d)

**Response:** Comments on specific road projects for funding are considered during the annual VDOT Six-Year Program Update.

---

### 3.4 Elm Place and Morgan Lane

**Suggestion:** Inquiry regards a developer vacation request of Elm Place and Morgan Lane which adjoin her property. Comprehensive Plan lists the roads for improvements. Need to take these improvements off Comprehensive Plan to allow street abandonment. (ID: 9, SubID: 0009a)

**Response:** The suggestion concerns the road extensions of Elm Place and Morgan Lane, designated in the current Transportation Plan. These extensions were planned as local streets to access residential properties and connect the development.

However, the surrounding areas were later developed without developers dedicating land or making improvements to either of these extensions. Access in and out of subdivisions is oriented to other local streets, and topography along the planned alignments is overly steep.

During the 1997 – 1998 Area Plans Review, both extensions were proposed to be removed from the Transportation Plan and staff supported the proposals. It was suggested at the public hearing process that an area study might be needed to evaluate these proposals. The area study was not conducted and the area has been developed into residential neighborhoods; therefore, there is little benefit to undertake such a study or continue the designation of local street extensions. Staff recommends that both extensions be removed from the Transportation Plan.

---

### 3.5 Greensboro Extension

**Suggestion:** Extend Greensboro Drive through land units I and H in Tysons Corner.  
(ID: 141, SubID: 0141a)

**Response:** The County is currently undertaking a study of Tysons Area Transportation and Urban Design. This study will examine traffic circulation, pedestrian access and urban design in station areas in conjunction with the approved Metro extension to Tysons. The extension of Greensboro Road is included for evaluation in this study. The Plan Update will defer recommendations in Tysons until the study is completed.

---

### 3.6 Gunston Cove Road

**Suggestion:** Gunston Cove Road Bridge over CSX tracks has been closed recently due to damage to the bridge abutment foundations. Understand that the issue is ownership, but this bridge has served the residents of southeastern Fairfax for many years. Vital link to motorists going onto I-95. Replacement and rehabilitation is urgently needed and needs to be added to VDOT Six-Year Transportation Program. (ID: 271, SubID: 0271a)

**Suggestion:** The repair of the Gunston Cove Bridge and its ultimate opening will help relieve the considerable traffic build-ups on Market Square Road and Lorton Road east of I-95. Immediate efforts to repair and open this bridge will alleviate traffic flow along Lorton Road. (ID: 286, SubID: 0286f)

**Suggestion:** The railroad bridge over Gunston Cove Road on the south side of Lorton significantly impedes traffic moving on Route 1 in the southern section of Fairfax County. The construction of a new bridge will require a long lead-time; however, its completion will facilitate the flow of traffic on Route 1 pending funding of the improvements of Route 1 from Armistead to the Occoquan. The replacement of this road choke point will provide immediate relief to traffic congestion in advance of the ultimate improvements to Route 1. (ID: 286, SubID: 0286g)

**Response:** The new road being built by the developer is a 4-lane divided road connecting Lorton Road and Route 1, in parallel to Gunston Cove Road. Upon completion, the new road will provide traffic circulation in the vicinity. Regarding the bridge, VDOT is studying project estimates and funding sources.

---

**Suggestion: [Referred From South County APR Nominations]** Delete the last paragraph in Attachment A (LP2 Lorton South Route 1 Community Planning Sector, Page 82) and remove the dotted line extension of Market Road in the attached figure 22 (LP2 Lorton South Route 1 Community Planning Sector, Page 83) between Gunston Cove Road and Hassett Street at Route 1. (ID: 376, SubID: 0376d)

**Response:** The recommendation for this road extension resulted from an extensive study of the area, Lorton – South Route 1 Study, that resulted in a Plan Amendment adopted in 1991. Its stated purpose, which is to focus traffic away from Route 1 and to provide additional access, remains valid today. Without a compelling justification to remove it, it is recommended that this road remain on the Plan.

---

### 3.7 Hooes Road

**Suggestion:** The opening of the South County Secondary School and increased commuter traffic in the South County area calls for early completion of the widening of Hooes Road between Silverbrook Road and the Parkway. The committee does not endorse the completion of widening Hooes Road between Silverbrook Road and Route 123 pending completion of the FCDOT study on transportation needs mentioned at the top of the report.  
(ID: 286, SubID: 0286h)

**Response:** All roads within the Laurel Hill area are the subject of a current transportation study expected to be completed by early 2006. Comments on specific road projects for funding are considered during the annual VDOT Six-Year Program Update.

---

**Suggestion:** Intersection of Hooes Road and Silverbrook Road. The County should take immediate steps to address the lack of a left turn lane from westbound Silverbrook Road onto southbound Hooes Road. Improve the pedestrian flow through the establishment of crosswalks to facilitate students walking from west Hooes Road to the South County Secondary School.  
(ID: 286, SubID: 0286a)

**Response:** County staff is currently scoping this intersection improvement and the County will develop an order of magnitude cost estimate. The County will forward this to VDOT; however, there is currently no County or VDOT funding for this improvement.

---

### **3.8 Hunter Mill Road**

#### **3.8.1 Road and Bridge Improvement Suggestions**

**Suggestion:** Widen all of Hunter Mill in order to speed up traffic during rush hour. Make it four lanes to help with the back up.  
(ID: 227, SubID: 0227b)

**Suggestion:** In favor of improvements to Hunter Mill. It is unsafe and needs to be widened.  
(ID: 251, SubID: 0251a)

**Response:** Hunter Mill Road is a north-south connector in the County's transportation network. The sections between Vale Road and Route 123 and at the Dulles Toll Road interchange north of Sunrise Valley Drive are currently on the Transportation Plan for widening to four lanes.

In addition to road widening in these two areas, the Transportation Plan Map designates corridor wide improvements on the entire two-lane road with better geometry, turning lanes and median and other necessary safety measures. Proposed roadway improvements are conducted with local communities and there are various viewpoints on Hunter Mill Road.

---

**Suggestion:** Concerned about the flooding on Difficult Run over Hunter Mill Road with the high speeds of drivers. Raise and widen the bridge to alleviate flooding and slow down speeders.  
(ID: 227, SubID: 0227a)

**Response:** VDOT and County transportation staff worked with the community in the past on bridge improvements; however the bridge projects were not implemented due to community objection.

---

**Suggestion:** Should be improved with more left turn lanes and shoulders, not by making it a four lane highway.  
(ID: 268, SubID: 0268a)

**Response:** The Transportation Plan Map designates corridor wide improvements on the two-lane road sections with better geometry, turning lanes and median and other necessary safety measures. The sections between Vale Road and Route 123 and at the Dulles Toll Road interchange north of Sunrise Valley Drive are recommended for widening to four lanes.

---

**Suggestion:** Wants to delete 4-lane designations for Hunter Mill Road between Lewis Knolls Drive (Oakcrest Farm Community) and Vale Road. Would like Hunter Mill to be two lanes only, not including turn lanes, in this road section. (ID: 13, SubID: 0013a)

**Response:** The section of Hunter Mill Road, south of Vale Road, is expected to exhibit increase congestion during peak periods according to preliminary travel forecasting findings. Eliminating the planned four-lane segment would create a bottleneck for the Hunter Mill Corridor, affecting both local residents as well as commuter through traffic.

---

### 3.8.2 Character of Hunter Mill Road

**Suggestion:** Create a new category of road for Hunter Mill from Route 123 to Baron Cameron to recognize the changing character of transportation needs and to meet challenges. (ID: 289, SubID: 0289a)

**Suggestion:** Proposed guiding principles for Hunter Mill Road's Master Plan: 1). characteristics that qualified Hunter Mill Road as a Virginia Byway should be preserved, 2). maintained as a two-lane road with a design speed of 37mph, 3). primary function to serve the transportation needs of the neighborhoods along road, 4). hiking, biking and equestrian trails adjacent to road and 5). principles of Context Sensitive Design and Traffic Calming measure will be used. (ID: 136, SubID: 0136a)

**Suggestion:** Endorse Hunter Mill Road as a two-lane, scenic byway strategically located in a district eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, with primary function of serving neighborhoods along the road. (ID: 139, SubID: 0139a)

**Suggestion:** 1). Preserve the characteristics of Hunter Mill Road as a Virginia byway; 2). Maintain Hunter Mill as a 2-lane road with a speed limit of 35mph; 3). The primary function of Hunter Mill Road will be to serve needs of the neighborhoods along the road; 4). Hiking, biking, equestrian trails will be adjacent to the road; 5). Traffic calming measures and principles of context sensitive design will be used. (ID: 1, 2, 3, Group Mail Petition; 4, 5, 6, Group Online Petition)

**Response:** Hunter Mill Road is a north-south connector in the County's transportation network. According to the travel demand analysis, Hunter Mill is projected to experience a higher level of congestion by 2030 even when the County takes on intensive transit and HOV improvements across the County.

Hunter Mill Road is functioning and will continue to function as an arterial in the transportation network. Restricting the planned four-lane sections to two lanes would have adverse congestion impacts not only for through traffic, but also for

local traffic seeking to access adjacent neighborhoods. Staff recommends that the planned four-lane sections, between Route 123 and Vale Road and north of Sunrise Valley Drive, be retained. Hunter Mill Road remains classified as a minor arterial in the transportation network.

Staff supports the proposal to preserve the character of Hunter Mill Road as a Virginia Byway and recommends that any transportation improvements take into consideration the needs and the value of preserving heritage resources in the corridor. Principles of traffic calming and context-sensitive design may be incorporated into future improvement of the roadway.

Staff also encourages the neighborhood, working with the County's non-motorized transportation committee, to plan and support construction of non-motorized facilities along the corridor.

---

**Suggestion:** Hunter Mill should be designated as a "Virginia Byway."  
(ID: 52, SubID: 0052b)

**Suggestion:** Need to acknowledge the road as a heritage resource.  
(ID: 289, SubID: 0289b)

**Response:** Hunter Mill Road is designated as Virginia Byway for its heritage resources. However this designation would not necessarily limit transportation improvements. Potential future transportation improvements would need to be evaluated in consultation with the community to ensure conservation of the scenic heritage resources in the corridor.

---

**Suggestion:** Focus on integration of pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian use.  
(ID: 289, SubID: 0289c)

**Response:** Communities in the Hunter Mill Corridor may work with the County's Trails and Sidewalks Committee, to plan and support construction of non-motorized transportation facilities along the corridor.

---

### 3.8.3 Traffic Operations (Hunter Mill Road)

**Suggestion:** Support the prohibition of trucks using Hunter Mill to cut through from I-66 to Route 7 in Reston.  
(ID: 139, SubID: 0139b)

**Response:** Through Truck Traffic restrictions are considered under a separate process with VDOT.

---



**Suggestion:** Increase speed of Hunter Mill to 40mph to leave the other parts of the road alone. Other problems with the road are flooding a couple times of year and snow for amateur drivers.  
(ID: 143, SubID: 0143a)

**Response:** The posted speed limit on Hunter Mill Road is currently under consideration by VDOT following a request from the Board of Supervisors.

---

**Suggestion:** Need stop light at Hunter Mill and Marbury Road. There is a stop sign now, but it is very difficult to turn left onto Hunter Mill and many have gotten into car accidents. Drivers speed down Hunter Mill and there is hardly ever a police presence. Oakton is taxed at high rates but receives little in the form of county services.  
(ID: 138, SubID: 0138a)

**Response:** This suggestion has been forwarded to VDOT, which is responsible for traffic signals. There is a current study under the auspices of the Northern Virginia Regional Commission to evaluate traffic calming options for Hunter Mill Road.

---

### 3.9 I-66

**Suggestion:** Highway widening is vital on selected segments but must fit in cost effectively. Widen I-66 between Washington Boulevard and the West Falls Church split, not taking out transit parking at East Falls Church.  
(ID: 135, SubID: 0135c)

**Response:** This location is in Arlington County and it is not shown on the Fairfax County Transportation Plan.

---

**Suggestion:** Would like I-66 rail extension stations shown on map.  
(ID: 132, SubID: 0132a)

**Suggestion:** Land shall be preserved as rights-of-way for the Centreville and Stringfellow Metro Stations and parking.  
(ID: 125, SubID: 0125h)

**Response:** Both the current and the recommended County Transportation Plan Map designate locations for potential parking and station facilities along the I-66 corridor, for which land could be obtained through the development review process. Right of way is already reserved for the future Metro station and related parking and transit facilities at Stringfellow Road. Right of way for parking has also been obtained at Fairfax Corner.

---

**Suggestion:** Dedicate a bus lane on I-66 during rush hours (the shoulder lane marked with red/ green X for example). If there is not enough bus traffic to justify a dedication, add buses and routes instead.  
(ID: 169, SubID: 0169a)

**Response:** The current HOV lanes are capable of accommodating bus traffic. Simply adding a bus lane would not take advantage of the available capacity in the HOV lane. In addition, without widening I-66, a separate bus lane could significantly impact the general travel lanes which are already congested during peak periods. A direct ramp to and from I-66 West to access the Vienna Station is anticipated for design in the VDOT six-year program. This will provide better bus access to the station, directly from the HOV lanes. The County Transportation Plan Map designates I-66 as an Enhanced Public Transportation Corridor and shows the extension of Metrorail to the Centreville area. In the interim, the County and VDOT have programmed funding for the design of a HOV or bus ramp from I-66 and from the Vienna Metro Station. The VDOT I-66 Multimodal Transportation and Environmental Study, when complete, will address the needs and feasibility of specific improvements in the I-66 corridor. Detailed VDOT study information can be obtained at <http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/studynova-rt66.asp>.

### 3.10 I-95

**Suggestion:** Strongly supports the addition of a fourth lane on I-95 from Newington to the Occoquan as an essential element in removing commuter traffic from our local roads and improving our ability to move around the region.  
(ID: 286, SubID: 0286i)

**Response:** Both the current and the proposed Countywide Transportation Plan Map designate a fourth lane on I-95 from Newington to the Occoquan. Travel demand forecasting also reflects the performance of I-95 with the fourth lane. This is a current project in the VDOT Six-Year program.

---

**Suggestion: [Referred from the South Couth APR Nominations]** Add the following text to the circled text Attachment A (Area IV Plan Overview, Page 9). “Add a third HOV lane to I-95 from the Pentagon to Prince William County and reduce HOV-3 to HOV-2”.  
(ID: 376, SubID: 0376e)

**Response:** The County’s Transportation Plan already includes a third HOV lane through Fairfax County. Regional policy is to retain HOV-3 on I-95 and I-395 and adopt HOV-3 for other facilities by 2015. The Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments (COG) periodically evaluates the effectiveness of HOV lanes in the metropolitan Washington, DC region. COG published a draft of the last such evaluation in September 2005 based on data collected in Spring 2004. This report concludes that “Barrier-separated and exclusive HOV facilities continue to provide substantial savings in travel time” and that “HOV lane person throughput on a per lane per hour basis continues to outperform adjacent non HOV lanes.” Consequently we do not recommend adding language to the Plan regarding HOV regulations.

---

**Suggestion: [Referred from the South Couth APR Nominations]** Add the following new bullet and text after the 1<sup>st</sup> bullet under land unit 6 in Attachment A, “A direct truck access should be constructed at least from southbound I-95 onto the road built to service the County Resource Recovery Facility and debris land fill”. Add a circle on figure 11 for such an interchange improvement.  
(ID: 376, SubID: 0376c)

**Response:** Staff recommends against adding a circle for an interchange improvement at this location. Adding a new Interstate access point requires approval by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Gaining such approval requires significant analysis and justification. Historically, FHWA has refused to add ramps to/from interstate facilities for single uses.

---

---

### 3.11 I-495

**Suggestion:** Will there be new roads constructed in Alexandria between South Van Dorn and Telegraph Road that runs north to south of I-495/ I-95? There are no other roads that bridge the north and south between those two roads, roughly 5 miles apart. (ID: 137, SubID: 0137a)

**Response:** There are no new road connections planned for this area in Fairfax County. The concerned location also impacts the City of Alexandria.

---

### 3.12 Lee Chapel Road

**Suggestion:** Encourage VDOT to secure funding to widen this stretch to four lanes and thereby complete the Lee Chapel Road widening. (ID: 286, SubID: 0286j)

**Response:** Comments on specific road projects for funding are considered during the annual VDOT Six-Year Program Update.

---

### 3.13 Little River Turnpike

**Suggestion:** The current Comprehensive Plan has Route 236 going through downtown Annandale to become 6 lanes with a grade separated interchange from the existing 4 lanes. It should be eliminated from the current edition of the plan since in the county revitalization program Annandale is proposed to be a mixed use town center that encourages local use and traffic reduction. Eliminate the language. (ID: 129, SubID: 0129a)

**Response:** In the past year, VDOT, working with Fairfax County, undertook the Annandale Circulation Study to evaluate a one-way, pair street system as an alternative to the six lane planned widening of Little River Turnpike in downtown Annandale, and necessity of the planned interchange. This is an evaluation of circulation needs in the area, different from the macro-level evaluation in the County Transportation Plan Update. Based on results of this circulation study, staff supports removing the planned interchange at Route 236 and Ravensworth Road. However, the circulation study concluded that Route 236 should remain as 6-lanes on the Transportation Plan, pending further analysis. Detailed information about this study can be found at project website: <http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/const-project.asp?ID=298>

---

### 3.14 Lorton Road

**Suggestion:** Change I-95/Lorton Road interchange to partial interchange improvement.

(ID: 134, SubID: 0134a)

**Suggestion:** Currently the Transportation Plan shows the interchange at Lorton Road/I-95 to become a full interchange. Map should show interchange as a partial improvement since there is no design or time frame for project. Feels it is prudent to identify and reserve sufficient right-of-way for partial interchange providing for on-ramp to I-95 South from Lorton Road eastbound instead. That design would require less ROW than would be required for full cloverleaf also eliminating the need for a left turn. Also the project would be more cost effective to complete sooner.

(ID: 280, SubID: 0280a)

**Response:** The interchange on Lorton Road at I-95 is critical to facilitate local traffic to access and exit the highway. Most local traffic will be generated from east and west parts of the Lorton Road vicinity. While the plan designates a full interchange, suitability of a full or partial interchange at this location should be determined through a future interchange study. Staff recommends a full-interchange designation be retained on the Transportation Plan, subject to further study.

---

**Suggestion:** [Referred from the South Couth APR Nominations] Plan Lorton Road as a 4 lane from Silverbrook Road to Ox Road (change two 6's to 4's) in attachment A.

(ID: 376, SubID: 0376f)

**Response:** As recommended in the Laurel Hill Transportation Analysis, Lorton Road is now 4-lanes on the recommended Transportation Plan Map.

---

### 3.15 McLearen Road

**Suggestion:** Support McLearen Road extension. This road is needed to alleviate traffic. Has been on the books since the 70s – should finally be funded and constructed.

(ID: 230, SubID:0230a)

**Suggestion:** Opposed to McLearen Road / Lawyers Road extension through Fox Mill Estates.

(ID: 7, 8, Group Online Petition)

**Suggestion:** Do not want McLearen Road expansion. Road will split neighborhood and change environment around Fox Mill Elementary School. Please remove off plan and plan map.

(ID: 18, SubID: 0018a)

**Suggestion:** Would like EIS for McLearen road extension. Just because project has been on plan for 30 years doesn't mean that it has to stay on the plan.

(ID: 256, SubID: 0256a)

**Suggestion:** Against Lawyers Road extension and McLearen Road exit in the county trans plan.

(ID: 56, SubID: 0056a)

**Suggestion:** Opposed to McLearen Road / Lawyers Road extension through Fox Mill Estates. If the road is built, children will no longer be able to walk to school. The road will intersect Viking Drive between her house and the school and pedestrian access will become dangerous requiring children to bus to school. Attracted to this neighborhood because of sidewalk and walking access to school.

(ID: 71, SubID: 0071a)

**Response:** The McLearen Road extension is recommended to stay on the Transportation Plan. The right-of-way of the planned McLearen Road extension from Reston Parkway to West Ox Road was dedicated when the community was developed. Consequently, no EIS was prepared for this improvement. The extension is considered an important east-west connector and is classified as a Minor Arterial Type A in the transportation network. Based on traffic forecasting, 1500 to 3000 vehicles will use this facility during the afternoon peak hour. On a daily basis, 14,000 to 25,000 vehicles are forecast to use this facility by the year 2030. The forecasting indicates that the road extension will divert a significant amount of traffic from portions of the Fairfax County Parkway, West Ox Road, and Centreville Road.

While specifics about project design are beyond the scope of this Plan Update, the road design should incorporate design principals and facilities that are neighborhood friendly, such as pedestrian paths, bike trails or on-road bike lanes, and landscaping in the median or along the roadside to serve as a buffer for the residential areas.

**Suggestion:** Would like a copy of EIS and cost benefit analysis for the McLearen Road Extension project.  
(ID: 270, SubID: 0270a)

**Response:** Engineering studies are conducted once a project is programmed for implementation. With limited funding sources in recent years, the McLearen Road extension, as well as many other urgent road improvements in the County, has not yet been addressed.

When projects such as the McLearen Road extension become funded, they are subject to an environmental evaluation in accordance with VDOT procedures (which could be an environmental assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement).

Footnote: Although this extension has been called Lawyers Road / McLearen Road, it is officially the McLearen Road extension.

---

### 3.16 Mount Vernon Roads

**Suggestion:** [Referred from South County APR Nominations] Change the number 8 to 6 in the circled text of attachment A, figures, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43, 51 and 55.  
(ID: 376, SubID: 376a)

**Response:** In December 2004 the Board of Supervisors directed this to be incorporated in the Transportation Plan Update. This change is now shown on the proposed Transportation Plan Map. The proposed plan shows six through lanes on Richmond Highway from the Capital Beltway to Buckman Road / Route 235 north intersection and four through lanes from Buckman Road / Route 235 north intersection to Fairfax County Parkway intersection. All figures in Area Plans will be changed to reflect this.

---

**Suggestion:** [Referred from South County APR Nominations] Substitute the following for the circled text of attachment A (MV8-Woodlawn Community Planning Sector, Page 162). “Align Buckman Road with Radford Avenue”.  
(ID: 376, SubID: 0376b)

**Response:** This is already part of the current Transportation Plan. The map for this this Planning Sector will be corrected in conjunction with the Transportation Plan Update.

---



### 3.17 Old Mill Road

**Suggestion:** Old Mill extension between Route 1 and Telegraph Road should be four lanes.

(ID: 72, SubID: 0072b)

**Response:** The revised Transportation Plan proposes four lanes for the segment of Old Mill Road between Route 1 and Telegraph Road to serve traffic in the Ft. Belvoir area, including jobs being relocated to the main base due to the Base Relocation and Closure Act (BRAC). Final recommendation on the planned Old Mill widening and extension will be subject to the study currently undertaken by the Federal Highway Administration and U.S. Department of Defense.

---

**Suggestion:** Old Mill Road (east of Route1) shall be a Type B minor arterial from Route1 to Mount Vernon Memorial Highway.

(ID: 72, SubID: 0072c)

**Response:** The segment of Old Mill Road east of Route 1 carries a high portion of local traffic from the surrounding neighborhood thus functioning differently than the segment west of Route1. Therefore, Old Mill Road, east of Route 1, should retain its classification as a collector street.

---

### 3.18 Pohick Road

**Suggestion:** Widen the small two-lane section of Pohick Road east of I-95 to four lanes as previously considered in the six-year plan.  
(ID: 286, SubID: 0286k)

**Response:** This section of Pohick Road is designated in the current Comprehensive Plan for 4 lanes. However there is no funding currently for this project. Comments on specific road projects for funding are considered during the annual VDOT Six-Year Program Update.

---

### 3.19 Silverbrook Road

**Suggestion:** The State and County should take steps to immediately accelerate widening Silverbrook from Monacan Road to Hooes Road to four lanes to include trail improvements along Silverbrook Road to facilitate students walking to the South County Secondary School (SCSS). The remaining portions of Silverbrook Road from Lorton Road to Monacan Road are being widened concurrent with the Laurel Hill development. The remaining section of Silverbrook Road, while on the Comprehensive Plan as four lanes, is unfunded. The combination of the South County Secondary School opening and continued development in Laurel Hill creates increasing safety and transportation concerns.  
(ID: 286, SubID: 0286e)

**Response:** Silverbrook Road is recommended to remain on the plan as a 4-lane road. Comments on specific road projects for funding are considered during the annual VDOT Six-Year Program Update.

---

### 3.20 South Van Dorn Street

**Suggestion:** [Referred from South County APR Nominations] On transportation plan map, remove proposed collector street from Crown Royal Drive to South Van Dorn Street.

(ID: 375, SubID: 0375a)

**Response:** Staff recommends that the connector road remain of the Plan due to its proximity to a planned interchange. Currently Fairfax County is designing a grade separated interchange at the intersection of South Van Dorn Street and Franconia Road (DPWES Project Number 064246) as recommended on the Comprehensive Plan. This design is a diamond interchange that lowers South Van Dorn Street below Franconia Road and connects the two roadways with ramps that parallel South Van Dorn Street. One of these ramps will intersect South Van Dorn Street in the vicinity of the intersection with Woodfield Estates Drive. Having traffic merge close to a signalized intersection can create operational problems. This possibility had been anticipated and resulted in the connector road being placed on the Comprehensive Plan. To improve the traffic operations it is anticipated that the movements would be restricted to right in and right out only at this intersection.

---

### 3.21 Western County Roads

**Suggestion:** Construction of intersection at Braddock Road and Walney Road, and Leland extension should be coordinated with Centreville Historic District Planning.

(ID: 125, SubID: 0125a)

**Response:** Staff concurs.

---

**Suggestion:** Encourage the realignment of Braddock Road, east of Pleasant Valley Road, onto Old Lee Road.

(ID: 125, SubID: 0125b)

**Response:** The current Transportation Plan calls for establishing the connection between Braddock Road and Old Lee Road east of Pleasant Valley Road. Refer to the Transportation Plan Map for specifics.

---

**Suggestion:** Poplar Tree Road, north of Braddock shall be widened in such a way to ensure pedestrian safety as well as ease traffic flow.

(ID: 125, SubID: 0125c)

**Response:** Pedestrian safety is considered on all projects per VDOT and County Policies. Comments on specific road projects for funding are considered during the annual VDOT Six-Year Program Update.

---

**Suggestion:** Meherrin Drive shall not connect to Bull Run Post Office Road and that part shall be removed from all maps.  
(ID: 125, SubID: 0125e)

**Response:** Meherrin Drive is a local road serving residential areas. There is no designation of a road extension on the Transportation Plan Map.

---

**Suggestion:** Traffic going south on Old Centreville Road shall be diverted onto Route 28 north of Compton Road/ Rt. 28 intersection. The traffic signal shall suffice as a flyover may not be possible.  
(ID: 125, SubID: 0125f)

**Response:** No flyover is shown on the current Transportation Plan; however, Route 28 is subject to additional study and part of the future 6 lane project.

---

### 3.22 Wiehle Avenue Extension

**Suggestion:** Eliminate Wiehle Avenue extension from Dranesville Road to Crestview Drive.

(ID: 235, SubID: 0235a)

**Response:** The Wiehle Avenue extension east of Dranesville Road has been on the Countywide Transportation Plan map since 1975. Right-of-way for Wiehle Avenue has been set aside during the development review process. It is planned to function as a minor arterial road; other roads in the area, such as Hiddenbrook Drive, serve as collectors and local streets. With the absence of the Wiehle Avenue extension, those roads of lower grade in the roadway network are forced to carry a heavier volume of traffic.

Staff recommends that this connection remain on the Plan. Further study needs to be done to determine whether the designation should be 2 lanes or 4 lanes. Should only two lanes be required, the additional right-of-way could be used for non-vehicular improvements that benefit the community, for example, pedestrian paths, bike trails and landscaping).

---

#### **4 Braddock District Task Force** (ID: 377, SubID: 0377a)

**Suggestion:** Objective 1, Policy a. Integrate motorized and non-motorized transportation facilities and services with transportation elements in both the Transportation Plan and Countywide Trails Plan.

**Response:** This language has been incorporated in this policy.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 1, Policy e. Design and construct trails, sidewalks, overpasses, bike lanes and(or) other necessary non-motorized facilities leading to and accessing public/mass transit facilities and commuter connection points.

**Response:** This language has been incorporated in this policy.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 2, Amend Policy c as follows: Provide HOV/HOT lanes on congested freeways where substantial travel time savings (generally 8 to 10 minutes or more) can be afforded and HOV/HOT volumes are likely to exceed 500 vehicles per lane in the peak hour. Develop an integrated HOV/HOT lane system with direct connections between HOV/HOT park-and-ride lots, transit centers, and other modal transfer facilities and to major mixed-use Centers. Integrate HOV/HOT access points to facilitate commuter access; accommodate new and emerging modes of commuting such as ride-share and slug lines. Enforce HOV/HOT regulations.

**Response:** This concept has been incorporated in Objective 2, policy c. However, specific time savings and volumes are not included as this is a generalized policy.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 2, Add new policy: Facilitate HOV/HOT on the Beltway by providing feeder HOT/HOT access lanes on connecting corridor roads.

**Response:** This concept has been incorporated in Objective 2, policy c and a new policy would be duplicative.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 2, amend Policy h: Provide for effective management and maintenance of County-owned transportation facilities, including trails, park-and-ride lots, bus garages, and FAIRFAX CONNECTOR vehicles.

**Response:** This concept is incorporated into Objective 2, policy f to the extent that this policy states "...and provide resources to maintain County-owned equipment and facilities effectively."

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 2, amend Policy n: Implement innovative technologies, services, and methods that increase transit ridership and/or productivity such as privatization, pricing, and time-transfer service. Concurrently, plan for development of intracounty and crosscounty connections with frequent transit service from transportation hubs. Explore the availability of

Federal programs to underwrite new services and facilities. Encourage competition for transit services from non-traditional providers (taxis, jitneys, short-route connector buses).

**Response:** This concept is incorporated in Objective 2, policy 1. There was an effort to make the proposed objectives and policies more succinct than the current ones. Therefore, some policies were shortened.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 2, add new policy: Ensure adequate funding for promotion and marketing of public transit, ridesharing, bicycling, and walking. Make use of new technologies to provide service information.

**Response:** Funding is covered in Objective 8 of the proposed Policy Plan. The service information concept is included in Objective 2, policy 1.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 2, add new policy: Provide for collection points for local feeder traffic between and among major commuting centers such as VRE and Metro Centers.

**Response:** This concept is incorporated into the policies of Objective 2.

---

**Suggestion:** Amend Objective 3: Ensure a road system that provides adequate local access and capacity for through movements, consistent with financial, social, and environmental constraints and with the County's goal of reducing single-occupant vehicle usage.

**Response:** This language has been incorporated in this objective.

---

**Suggestion:** Change Objective 4: Implement a comprehensive network of trails and sidewalk and on-road bicycle routes in the overall transportation network and Transportation Plan.

**Response:** This concept has been incorporated in the proposed objective.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 4, change Policy a: Emphasize construction of missing links to provide non-motorized and pedestrian access to transit hubs and stations. Explore funding strategies that include, but are not limited to, bonds, grants, proffers, and private/public partnerships.

**Response:** These concepts have been incorporated in Objective 4, policy and Objective 8, policy d.

---

**Suggestion:** Change Objective 5: Ensure that improvements to the transportation system are cost-effective and consistent with environmental, land use, social, and economic goals.

**Response:** This language has been incorporated in Objective 6.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5, add new Policy c: Evaluate transportation systems in conjunction with local and Regional authorities to assess their contribution to and consistency with the Region's

Air Quality Plan. Review and evaluate new and emerging transportation systems for negative impacts on the Region's air quality.

**Response:** This concept has been incorporated into Objective 7, policies a and c.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5, add new Policy d: Encourage where feasible implementing programs of alternative fuel and zero/low pollution vehicles for County-owned and managed fleets and for commercially-owned and managed fleets.

**Response:** This concept is consistent with Objective 7, policy c. This suggestion is a specific strategy that could be adopted, and has been adopted for County-owned vehicles, to achieve the objective.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5, add new Policy e: Ensure that current studies and best practice procedures are available to County Staff and the public for their use and reference. Be informed by such best practices as "Walkable Communities", "Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning", "Mixed-Use Centers", "Blueways and Greenways", quality of community life, and ecological studies (air, water, noise, light, and wildlife habitat).

**Response:** This concept is incorporated into Objective 17, policy e.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5, add new Policy f: Support studies on best practices for comprehensive transportation and ecological impact data collection. Ensure that these studies and their data are available to the public.

**Response:** There is no proposed policy that specifically addresses this; however, quality data is essential for effective planning.

---

**Suggestion:** Add new Objective \_\_: Support the infrastructure for and promote telecommuting, teleconferencing and e-learning to reduce transportation demand.

**Response:** A new TDM objective, Objective 5, is proposed.

---

**Suggestion:** Add a new Policy a. Collect data on and evaluate telecommuting, teleconferencing, and e-learning for impact on reduction of single occupant vehicle usage.

**Suggestion:** Add a new Policy b. Work with the private sector and County and Federal government entities to promote and establish telecommuting, teleconferencing, and e-learning strategies and policies. Actively market benefits of such programs and educate both employers and employees about the advantages of such alternative work locations.

**Suggestion:** Add a new Policy c. Use existing programs with Fairfax County as models and incentives for others to emulate.

**Response:** Proposed policy e of the TDM objective incorporates the concepts suggested in policy b above. Data collection would be part of an improved County TDM program and the County would use successful TDM programs as models for others to emulate, but these are implementation components of the policies.



---

**Suggestion:** Change Objective 7: Identify the funding needed for the County's transportation system and potential sources for that funding.

**Response:** This language has been incorporated in Objective 8.

---

**Suggestion:** Under a new objective, change Policy a: Employ both public and private sources of financial support for the County's transportation systems.

**Suggestion:** Under a new objective, change Policy b: Ensure that the County makes use of all available State and Federal funding sources.

**Suggestion:** Under a new objective, change Policy c: Seek funding from any regional authorities that are or may be created.

**Response:** These concepts are incorporated in the proposed policies of Objective 8.

---

**Suggestion:** Under a new objective, change Policy e: Increase funding for trails and walkways using any and all available resources.

**Response:** This concept has been incorporated in Objective 8, policy d.

---

**Suggestion:** Under a new objective, change Policy f: Seek multi-jurisdictional funding sources for transportation facilities and services as well as for marketing such facilities and services. Encourage and facilitate private sector initiatives to finance both new construction and improvements to existing facilities and services.

**Response:** Specifying funding for marketing is too detailed and implementation oriented for these policies. The language contained in the second sentence has been incorporated in Objective 8, policy c.

---

**Suggestion:** Under Objective 8, change Policy g: Reduce conflicts between non-motorized and motorized traffic and correct unsafe conditions for walking and bicycling.

**Response:** This language has been incorporated in Objective 9, policy h.

---

**Suggestion:** Under Objective 9, add a new policy: Promote grade separated street networks that enhance community aesthetics and preserve the residential character of the surrounding communities.

**Response:** This policy has not been included in the proposed policies; however, grade separated interchanges are recommended on the Transportation Plan Map at intersections of arterial roads.

---

**Suggestion:** Under Objective 9, change Policy d: Develop a roadway system that discourages through travel on local and collector streets. Work with VDOT and local communities to

implement Traffic Calming and other measures where needed to encourage motorists to drive and caution and consideration in residential communities.

**Response:** These concepts are incorporated in policies of Objectives 9 and 10.

---

**Suggestion:** Under Objective 9, change Policy e: Develop and implement a Corridor Management Program in cooperation with VDOT. Provide more capacity in North/South Corridors using alternative systems and facilities to single occupancy vehicles.

**Response:** Current policy e has not been retained in the proposed policies as its intent is covered by other policies.

---

**Suggestion:** Under Objective 10, change Policy b: Support public transportation and non-motorized travel through the design and development of building projects in Tysons Corner and Reston Urban Centers, Suburban Centers, Transit Station Areas, and Community Business Centers.

**Response:** Fairfax County's Comprehensive Plan formally designates Tysons Corner as an "urban center." To date it is the County's sole designated urban center.

---

**Suggestion:** Under Objective 13, add new policy: Coordinate the review process so that non-motorized pedestrian and motorized transportation needs are integrated.

**Response:** This concept is incorporated in proposed Objective 13, policy d.

---

**Suggestion:** Change Objective 14: Address the transportation challenges associated with events and with continuing and emerging trends in suburb-to-suburb commuting patterns.

**Suggestion:** Under Objective 13, add new policy c: Compliment existing transportation modalities with new mass transit facilities and systems and incorporate them into plans for connections among existing, new, and emerging major employment centers.

**Response:** Current Objective 14 is proposed to be deleted as it is duplicative with other objectives and policies.

---

## 5 Transportation for Seniors

**Suggestion:** Disappointed to find that the Transportation Policy Plan contains no reference to seniors and transportation. Will use the results of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission study on seniors coming this summer to suggest senior needs in the county plan.

(ID 269, SubID 0269a)

**Response:** The proposed policies specifically refer to the transportation needs of seniors.

---

## 6 Environmental Impact

### 6.1 Noise

**Suggestion:** Sound walls should be along all Interstate highways in Fairfax County.  
(ID17, SubID 0017a)

**Suggestion:** Sound walls should be installed when arterial roadway is constructed on a new location.  
(ID 17, SubID 0017b)

**Response:** Environmental impact policies require noise mitigation where certain noise levels are attained. Objective 7 emphasizes mitigation of impact on neighborhoods. Development or redevelopment adjacent to interstate highways and arterials may require sound walls if noise thresholds are exceeded. Sound walls are constructed where warranted on interstate and arterial roadways if a project is federally funded.

---

### 6.2 Chesapeake Bay Plan

**Suggestion:** How is FCDOT made accountable to the Chesapeake Bay sections of the comprehensive plan?  
[Http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/chesapeakebay/appendixb.pdf](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/comprehensiveplan/policyplan/chesapeakebay/appendixb.pdf)  
(ID 256, SubID 0256b)

**Response:** The Transportation Plan calls for minimizing environmental impacts of transportation projects under Objective 7. This objective outlines policies for environmental sensitive areas, storm-water runoff, and vehicle emissions standards. Please refer to the policy document for details.

---

## 7 Transportation Demand Management

**Suggestion:** Need to examine alternative work schedules in Fairfax County to 11pm. To alleviate traffic, volumes of peak traffic can be spread throughout. Businesses that conform to alternative hours should receive a reduced tax rate.  
(ID140, SubID 0140c)

**Response:** Alternative transportation means are emphasized in the revised Transportation Plan, through both policy review and demand forecasting. More intensive transit and HOV improvements are included in network analysis, some of which are recommended on the proposed Transportation Plan Map. A new TDM objective and policy section (Objective 5) is developed and added to the revised Plan. Please refer to objective 1 for details.

---

**Suggestion:** As a transportation alternative, telecommuting can provide a better work/ family balance, safer neighborhoods, and better air quality. Neighborhoods would have "extra eyes" with telecommuters home in the day. Air-quality would improve. As a pilot project, would recommend that the commercial real estate tax rate for companies in Tyson's Corner be reduced.  
(ID 140, SubID 0140b)

**Suggestion:** Must analyze other transportation alternatives to meet increased traffic congestion for the next 25 years.  
(ID 140, SubID 0140a)

**Suggestion:** "TDMs must be centerpiece of trans plan" and public involvement is a must for a workable TDM program. Does not want to see us keep paving more and more lanes to alleviate our transportation problems.  
(ID 16, SubID 0016b)

**Response:** Alternative transportation means are emphasized in the revised Transportation Plan, through both policy review and demand forecasting. More intensive transit and HOV improvements are included in network analysis, some of which are recommended on the proposed Transportation Plan Map. A new TDM objective and policy section (Objective 5) is developed and added to the revised Policy Plan. Telecommuting and flexible work schedule are elements of the TDM strategies.

---

**Suggestion:** Programs should be developed to encourage more carpooling on I-66, telecommuting and flextime. HOT lanes shall be implemented with vehicular safety foremost.  
(ID 125, SubID 0125j)

**Response:** Carpooling, telecommuting and flexible work schedule are advocated for the entire county under the newly created TDM objective. Any implementation of HOT lanes will require major study to identify demand, engineering feasibility, cost

and impacts on the County and the Region. VDOT is conducting studies on the Beltway HOT lanes and Shirley Highway HOT lanes, the first HOT initiatives in the DC region. For detailed information about this study, please visit. <http://www.virginiadot.org/projects/const-project.asp?ID=225>.

---

## 8 Traffic Operations

**Suggestion:** Consider several requests for traffic signals along Silverbrook Road between Hooes Road and Lorton Road including Sweet Pecan Drive and Bluebird Road. The committee notes that there will be a light at the intersection of Silverbrook Road and Laurel Crest Road and at South Run. These lights will create breaks in traffic that should permit access to Silverbrook Road from the other side streets. It is the committee's view at this time that, pending an assessment of the impact of the new lights, the Federation does not endorse additional traffic signals on this portion of Silverbrook Road. To support each request would establish four lights along a 2 mile stretch of Silverbrook Road.  
(ID 286, SubID 0286n)

**Response:** This comment has been forwarded to VDOT, which is responsible for traffic signals.

---

**Suggestion:** Improve the trail system along Silverbrook Road: the trail from the South County Secondary School heading south on the west side to Gunston Corner (1400 feet); the trail heading north from the South County Secondary School on the east side to include clearing of the brush blocking the view from Silverbrook Road between Monacan Road and Silverbrook Hunt; a trail heading down Hooes Road from the trail ending west of Crosspointe Glen and joining the trail that will be completed on the north side of Laurel Crest Road.  
(ID 286, SubID 0286m)

**Response:** The recommendation concerning trail connection to the South County Secondary School has been forwarded to the Fairfax County Park Authority for consideration in master planning of the Laurel Hill property.

---

**Suggestion:** The industrial zoned areas in southern Fairfax County, south of Lorton Road between and along I-95 and Route 1 are increasingly crowding residential neighborhoods, complicating commuter routes particularly along Route 1, Armistead Road, and Lorton Road. The committee sees increasing safety and traffic issues. The Comprehensive Plan should call for a study to determine ways to reroute trucks from the southern Lorton industrial areas onto I-95 by avoiding central Lorton and residential areas.  
(ID 286, SubID 0286l)

**Response:** Through Truck Traffic restrictions are considered under a separate process with VDOT (residential areas only).

---

**Suggestion:** Committee supports the community road maintenance and repair requests submitted by Hallowing Point and Gunston Manor.  
(ID 286, SubID 0286d)

**Response:** Road maintenance requests for public streets should be submitted to VDOT.

---

**Suggestion:** VDOT should retune traffic lights along Hooes Road from and including the intersections with Silverbrook Road, Newington Forest Avenue, and the Parkway access ramps and the intersection at Pohick Road.  
(ID 286, SubID 0286b)

**Response:** This comment has been forwarded to VDOT, which is responsible for traffic signals.

---

**Suggestion:** Fairfax County Parkway northbound at Newington Road needs 3 right turn lanes, starting at light with Terminal Road: 1 right turn lane at Newington Road, 2 right turn lanes for I-95 north.  
(ID 72, SubID 0072a)

**Response:** This plan update focuses on countywide improvements. The proposed turning movements have been forwarded to the Department of Transportation's traffic and capital project units for further review.

---



## 9 Roadway Functional Classification

### 9.1 Specific Changes

**Suggestion:** The following suggestions related to classification of arterial roads were received from the Mount Vernon Council as a referral from the South County APR cycle.

(ID 285, SubID 285a)

- a) Change Alban Road from Backlick Road to Rolling Road from minor arterial (Type B) to minor arterial (Type A).
- b) Add Armistead Road from Lorton Road to Richmond Highway as minor arterial (Type A)
- c) Retain Furnace Road from Richmond Highway to Ox Road as Type B minor arterial in the Comprehensive Plan
- d) Add Gambrill Road from Pohick Road to Fairfax County Parkway as Type B minor arterial.
- e) Add Gunston Cove Road from Richmond Highway to Lorton Road as Type B minor arterial.
- f) Add Hooes Road from Silverbrook Road to Ox Road as Type B minor arterial.
- g) Add Hooes Road from Silverbrook to Fairfax County Parkway as Type A minor arterial.
- h) Change Lorton Road from Type B minor arterial to Type A minor arterial from Richmond Highway to Ox Road (extend limit from Furnace Road).
- i) Add Lorton Station Boulevard as Type A minor arterial from Lorton Road to Pohick Road.
- j) Add Old Colchester Road as Historic By-way for 9000 Richmond Highway to 11000 Richmond Highway.
- k) Retain Ox Road as Principal Arterial from Fairfax City to Prince William County.
- l) Change limits of Pohick Road as Type B minor arterial from Fairfax County Parkway to Route 1 to Fairfax County Parkway to Rolling Road
- m) Change Pohick Road from Type B minor arterial to Type A minor arterial from Rolling Road to Richmond Highway.
- n) Retain Richmond Highway as Principal Arterial from Prince William County to Alexandria City
- o) Change Rolling Road from Type B minor arterial to Type A minor arterial from Braddock Road to Franconia-Springfield Parkway.
- p) Change Rolling Road from Fairfax County Parkway to Pohick Road from minor arterial (Type B) to minor arterial (Type A).
- q) Change Silverbrook Road from Type B minor arterial to Type A minor arterial for Lorton Road to Hooes Road.
- r) Retain Silverbrook Road as Type B minor arterial from Hooes Road to Ox Road.
- s) Retain Telegraph Road as Type A minor arterial from Alexandria City to Richmond Highway

**Response:** Most of these suggestions regarding functional classification relate to Type A and Type B minor arterials. As noted in the Appendix, this distinction is one made in the County Plan due to the wide disparity in the characteristics of the minor arterials in the County. This distinction is not one recognized by the Federal Highway Administration. As defined in the County's Plan, "Type A minor arterials ...perform a particularly significant function in the transportation network due to their length and/or design." "Type B minor arterials represent the remaining minor arterials which are somewhat shorter in length, traverse a less densely developed area or ..are built to a somewhat older design standard." The Appendix contains the full description of this distinction. Staff recommendations and responses are below:

- a. Retain as Type B minor arterial due to short length of segment.
- b. Concur. Segment would function in conjunction with Lorton Station Boulevard.
- c. Concur.
- d. Concur.
- e. Recommend retain existing classification.
- f. Concur. This is already in existing plan.
- g. Recommend retain existing classification.
- h. Recommend retain as Type B minor arterial as this road traverses park.
- i. Concur.
- j. Historic By-way is not a functional classification.
- k. Concur.
- l. Concur.
- m. Concur.
- n. Concur.
- o. Concur.
- p. Concur.
- q. Recommend retain existing classification.
- r. Concur.
- s. Concur.

## 9.2 Local Roads

**Suggestion:** Need for new road classification- Residential Service Road. Its primary purpose is to serve the neighborhood along the road.  
(ID 136, SubID 0136b)

**Suggestion:** Add a new classification "Residential Service" to enable a "walkable community". Design parameters should be the following:

- Maximum design speed of 35 mph
  - Highway width of 20 to 24 feet
  - Shoulder width of 5 to 15 feet
  - Round-a-bouts at intersections servicing through traffic
  - Sidewalks or trails to serve walking, biking and horse use
  - Adequate sight-distance to enable pedestrians to see cars, and drivers to see pedestrians, vehicles exiting driveways, and wildlife
  - ROW for underground utilities
  - Cross walks at all intersections
  - Bus pull-outs for school and commuter buses
- (ID 52, Sub ID 0052a)

**Response:** The Federal Highway Administration defines local streets as roads that provide direct access to abutting properties and access to higher order roads. Local roads offer the lowest level of mobility in the road network and service to through traffic movements is discouraged. The County Plan contains a classification for local streets. The proposed residential service road is essentially a type of local street serving residential areas and therefore would be redundant with local street classification.

---

### 9.3 Cut-Through Traffic

**Suggestion:** Calming measures on Crosspointe Drive. Crosspointe Drive is becoming a major commuter cut through between Route 123 and Silverbrook Road. Establish calming measures to reduce traffic through neighborhoods.  
(ID 286, SubID 0286c)

**Response:** The Residential Traffic Administration Program, administered by Fairfax County Department of Transportation, evaluates requests for traffic calming submitted through the offices of district supervisors.

---

**Suggestion:** Current map only calls for upgrades to major roads. Two lanes are being used heavily for "cut through" traffic by people to avoid more congested primary roads or to travel a more direct route to their destination. Accept that the traffic pattern will not change and see if road can be widened.  
(ID 103, SubID 0103a)

**Response:** In general, the County's Transportation Plan does not call for widening of existing two lane local streets through neighborhoods, nor is that consistent with the County policies. If there is a specific road that a community or others would like to propose for widening, that request can be reviewed. Congestion and inadequate network connection of the major roads are the major causes of cut -through traffic onto local streets. This Plan Update evaluates congestion in anticipation of future potential land use development and identifies potential network improvements. There are also other measures at smaller scale to mitigate cut-through traffic on local streets and these measures could be implemented with the participation of the community. The Traffic Operations Section of the County Department of Transportation is responsible for evaluating cut-through traffic issues in collaboration with VDOT.

---

## 10 Right-of-Way Requirement Guidelines

**Suggestion:** The right-of-way requirements discussed under freeways does not mention the Beltway improvements project, one of the more questionable aspects of the proposal by Fluor Daniel.  
(ID 102, SubID 0102g)

**Response:** The revised right-of-way guideline and configuration for HOT facilities on I-495 will be determined during the design phase of the Capital Beltway Project, undertaken by the Virginia Department of Transportation. Information on the Beltway study can be obtained at: <http://www.virginiadot.org/projects>

---

## 11 Plan Implementation, Review and Performance

### 11.1 Implementation

**Suggestion:** Plan element has many lofty goals with little method of implementation. None have a link to land use improvements or other tangible demand management. (ID: 102, SubID: 0102c)

**Response:** The Transportation Plan is an element of the County Comprehensive Plan. It focuses on objectives and policies, and identifies system improvements. Generally, implementation is not a component of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Transportation Plan is closely linked to the County's land use policy and development. Land use future is one of the foundations required for evaluating the performance of the transportation network. During this Plan Update, planners from the Department of Zoning and Planning provided a land use future alternative to focused household growth in activity centers and to balance residential and employment development, which ultimately affects the trips generated and the mode share in these centers. Other alternatives, based on the newly revised COG's forecasting, provide more detail and require assignment of employment and residential growth across the County. These are the tangible outcomes of the plan update to strengthen the land use - transportation linkage.

---

**Suggestion:** Objective 5, policies A & B mention providing a priority for projects that reduce auto-dependency, but there is no implementation strategy. (ID: 102, SubID: 0102i)

**Response:** The Transportation Plan is part of the County Comprehensive Plan. It focuses on objectives and policies, and identifies future system improvements. Generally, implementation is not a component of the Comprehensive Plan.

---

## 11.2 Plan Review

**Suggestion:** Thinks it is necessary to implement a tracking system to track goal progress. Skeptical about the objectives driving the project selection process.  
(ID: 35, SubID: 0035a)

**Response:** Staff concurs that it is desirable to track progress of implementing the objectives and policies of the Plan. Many such tracking systems are in place, but more could be done. Furthermore, availability of funding is a crucial factor in project implementation.

---

**Suggestion:** Participated in the Area Plan Review Committees for Providence District and feels that the process is broken in that the committee had little input from County Transportation Department staff despite the fact that transportation is the most important issue in the County. Without help from transportation staff committee has been forced to deny all increases in density. After attending the Transportation Plan meeting at Tysons-Pimmit Library it occurred that the County transportation staff simply provided the results from their transportation network analysis for the area being considered.  
(ID: 344, SubID: 0344a)

**Response:** There is an established process for evaluating Area Plan Review (APR) nominations. The process is managed by the Department of Planning and Zoning. Other agencies, including Transportation, Parks and Schools are involved and asked to provide comments on each nomination. The Department of Transportation provides comments on each nomination with respect to transportation impacts.

### 11.3 Plan Performance Measures

**Suggestion:** Build in performance measures to see progress and effects of change for example; vehicle miles traveled (VMT)/ capita overall and/ or along major corridors.  
(ID: 102, SubID: 0102a)

**Suggestion:** Objective 2 has the only numerical goals in the entire plan but they appear not to be measure or at least not reported.  
(ID: 102, SubID: 0102d)

**Suggestion:** Objective 13- The County should spell out various measures of effectiveness such as trends for trip times, mode shares, trip lengths, air quality, etc. and show how completed projects may have affected these measures and what we might expect from proposed projects. The priorities for new initiatives could then have some basis for assignment.  
(ID: 102, SubID: 0102h)

**Response:** Performance measures have been systematically used in the evaluation of transportation network improvement alternatives. These measures and outcomes will be analyzed and documented in the Technical Report of the Transportation Plan Update. The County's small area studies and project assessments always use performance measures, such as traffic level of service (LOS) and volume for capacity (V/C) ratios, to analyze effects of improvements.

---



## 11.4 2005 Plan Update Process

**Suggestion:** Public needs to be involved in initial planning stages (as stakeholder). Should be part of developing draft plan not just for written comments. Providence Council would like to assign representatives to attend stakeholder meetings.  
(ID: 11, SubID: 0011a)

**Suggestion:** Bothered that citizens were not represented in process flowchart in initial newsletter. She would like to be involved from the beginning as a citizen stakeholder and would like to attend all meetings along the way.  
(ID: 12, SubID: 0012a)

**Suggestion:** Sorry to see that on the website, the public is not viewed more as stakeholders in the process.  
(ID: 16, SubID: 0016a)

**Response:** Public involvement is essential to the County Transportation Plan Update. The newsletter and project website initiated in December 2004 were to provide project information and invite public suggestions from the very beginning of the process. The concern regarding the illustration of the schedule on the website was immediately corrected in January 2005 and staff provided responses to the comment providers.

In March 2005, seven project kick-off meetings were held across the county to engage the public in the review and discussion of the plan update, followed by the July 2005 workshops on transportation analysis and the November 2005 public meetings on the preliminary draft of the Transportation Plan. Only after the extensive public coordination process has been completed, will the Department of Transportation move forward to the formal public hearing process anticipated for early 2006.

---

## 12 Outside Scope of Plan Update

### 12.1 Bus Service Requests

**Suggestion:** Extend full service for Rt. 605, 621, 622 and 623 to newly developed communities on Government Center Parkway. With so many new homes being built, service should be provided. Also would like service on Rt. 29 to Vienna Metro. Suggests that Metro buses use Government Center Parkway and Waples Mill via Rt. 50 to get to the mall and to provide more service to potential riders.  
(ID: 73, SubID: 0073b)

**Response:** This suggestion concerns a short-term bus service issue. Additional bus service in the Government Center/Fairfax Corner areas of the County, including Government Center Parkway, was included in a response to the Board of Supervisors in regards to expansion plans for the Fairfax Connector. These plans proposed increased service levels and possible additional routes to commence operation in FY2009. Staff will work with Metrobus to evaluate the Metrobus route modification suggested.

---

**Suggestion:** Live at Fairfax Corner, near Ridge Top Road and Government Center Parkway. People go to Reston and Vienna Metro by bus. Need to have stops near community.  
(ID: 73, SubID: 0073a)

**Response:** This suggestion concerns a short-term bus service issue. This area referenced in the request is served currently by Fairfax Connector Routes 621 (weekday midday base and evening) and Routes 622 and 623 (weekday rush hours) to Vienna-Fairfax/GMU Metro. Fairfax Connector Route 605 also serves this area and links Fair Oaks to Reston. This suggestion was forwarded to the Fairfax Connector.

---

**Suggestion:** Reliable bus service, that is internet user friendly, is needed from Centerville to Dulles Airport, from Centerville to Fairfax County Government Center, via Fair Lakes, Fair Oaks Mall and Fair Oaks Hospital.  
(ID: 125, SubID: 0125i)

**Response:** The Regional Bus Study included several recommendations for enhancing bus service to and from Centerville, Fairfax County Government Center, City of Fairfax and Fair Oaks, where, if these services were to be provided, transfer connections could be made to other locations within Fairfax County. The ability to add higher levels of bus service to address these suggestions requires added bus capacity in terms of facilities and buses, as well as additional operating subsidy. The West Ox Road bus operations facility, currently scheduled to open in 2008, will provide the additional maintenance capacity to operate additional bus service.

---

**Suggestion:** Reroute Fairfax Connector bus route 403 to connect Vienna with Reston via Nutley Road, Chain Bridge, Flint Hill, Vale Road, Malcolm, Lawyers, Soapstone, Sunrise Valley, Wiehle, Northshore, Temporary to Reston Town Center. Should add 200 weekday passengers to transit and delete none.  
(ID: 135, SubID: 0135e)

**Response:** There is currently no transit route between Vienna and Reston. Fairfax Connector Route 403 partially covers the area just north of Route 123 to Vienna-Fairfax-GMU Metro. Reston can be accessed by Fairfax Connector Route 605 with a transfer connection at Government Center from Route 621 (weekday midday base and evening) and Route 623 (weekday rush hours) from Vienna Metro. The demographics north of Vienna and south of Reston with large single family homes do not appear to warrant traditional fixed route bus service. In addition the road network in that area currently lacks adequate pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks, for the safe boarding and alighting of passengers.

---

**Suggestion:** Need bus service from Northern Virginia (NOVA) Community College in Annandale to Merrifield and Dunn Loring with connections to Tyson's, Vienna and Arlington.  
(ID: 135, SubID: 0135f)

**Response:** The Regional Bus Study included a proposed recommendation to extend Metrobus Routes 29X and 29N to the Vienna-Fairfax/GMU Metorail Station to provide a transit link from the west to the NOVA Community College in Annandale. This recommendation will be considered for implementation, along with other recommendations of the Regional Bus Study, as funding becomes available.

---

**Suggestion:** Works at USGS and feels that there is a lack of transit services on site once the Fairfax Connector Route 951 stops running for the day. RIBS 1 and RIBS 3 buses run on site during rush hour, but should run all day long, at least during lunch hour. Many people would like to go out to lunch between Reston Town Center and Hunter Woods Center.  
(ID: 131, SubID: 0131a)

**Response:** The Sunrise Valley Drive and Sunset Valley Drive Corridors, paralleling the Dulles Toll Road, are viewed as potential bus circulator routes. These services could go in both clockwise and counterclockwise directions in large loops extending to and from the future Wiehle Avenue Metro Rail Station and could provide all day service. The operation of these routes would be in support of rail service.

---

**Suggestion:** The transportation plan is seriously lacking in providing an integrated bus system that incorporates the disjointed bus systems. Fairfax connector does not cooperate with WMATA and does not cooperate with Fairfax City Cue system. Every

jurisdiction is planning their own bus routes independent of other systems. Why? They all want money for transportation and are unwilling to share. This myopic view leaves huge gaps in the bus system that aren't addressed with a Road/Metro centric view. People can't get to where they need to be. That's why traffic exists, public transportation has failed miserably. Maybe if there were metrics to measure planning by, you would have figured this out by now.

(ID: 318, SubID: 0318a)

**Response:** The County's Transportation Plan is not a County bus service plan although transit use is accounted for in the travel demand forecasting model. In 2003 the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority WMATA, in cooperation with local jurisdictions, completed the Regional Bus Study that evaluated Metrobus service and bus service provided by local jurisdictions, such as the Fairfax Connector and the Fairfax City CUE system. The Regional Bus Study contains numerous recommendations for how the bus service in the Washington, DC metropolitan area can be improved and better coordinated. However, many of the recommendations would require increased funding. This report is available from WMATA or can be obtained from the Fairfax County Department of Transportation.

---

## 12.2 Land Use

**Suggestion:** Plan element has many lofty goals with little method of implementation. None have a link to land use improvements or other tangible demand management. (ID: 102, SubID: 0102c)

**Response:** The Transportation Plan is an element of the County Comprehensive Plan. It focuses on objectives and policies, and identifies system improvements. Generally, implementation is not a component of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Transportation Plan is closely linked to the County's land use policy and development. Land use future is one of the foundations required for evaluating the performance of the transportation network. During this Plan Update, planners from the Department of Zoning and Planning provided a land use future alternative to focused household growth in activity centers and to balance residential and employment development, which ultimately affects the trips generated and the mode share in these centers. Other alternatives, based on the newly revised COG's forecasting, provide more detail and require assignment of employment and residential growth across the County. These are the tangible outcomes of the plan update to strengthen the land use - transportation linkage.

---

**Suggestion:** Focus investments into areas using good land use through pedestrian and transit friendly development. Taxpayers should not continue to subsidize low-density development that increases roadway capacity. (ID: 35, SubID: 0035b)

**Response:** One focus of planning activities over the last 15 years has been to encourage pedestrian and transit friendly development within the County's transportation corridors. This emphasis is fully represented in the travel demand forecasting process for this plan update.

Land use is a foundation for developing the updated Transportation Plan and evaluating the effectiveness of the network. The land use, upon which the recommended countywide transportation network is developed and evaluated, focuses development in activity centers and improves the balance of job and households in these centers.

---

**Suggestion:** Increase land use densities to fund special tax district on I-66. (ID: 132, SubID: 0132c)

**Response:** Replanning in the I-66 corridor to higher density at appropriate locations has occurred over the last 20 years. Early efforts (in the 1980s) to increase density were the replanning of Centreville and the area now known as Fairfax Center; in the 1990s, Centreville Farms was re-planned to higher density and dedicated land

for a transit facility; in 2001, Merrifield and Dunn Loring were re-planned with higher density. Most recently the former Fairlee neighborhood (Metro West) at the Vienna Metro station was re-planned with a substantial increase in density. Whether a special tax district should be established is a specific implementation solution not in the scope of the Transportation Plan update.

---

### 12.3 Housing affordability

**Suggestion:** Concerned with housing affordability and housing density in the DC area.

(ID: 128, SubID: 0128a)

**Response:** Housing affordability and housing density are not directly addressed in the Transportation Plan. However, it is recognized that both of these housing issues have an impact on the transportation system. For this and other reasons, a key planning strategy pursued by the County has been to increase housing potential near and within areas of employment as indicated in the Comprehensive Plan's Concept for Future Development. A component of adding housing in employment centers and throughout the County is the provision of affordable housing units. These policies encourage people to live closer to their jobs with corresponding benefits to the transportation system. The Board of Supervisors has adopted policies to preserve affordable housing. More information on housing affordability policies and programs can be found at the County's Department of Housing and Community Development. Website: <http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/rha/>

---

## 12.4 Traffic data

**Suggestion:** Traffic Volumes for Route 1 and I-495 on the forecasting map are highly suspect from 20 years of driving experiences in the area.

(ID: 101, SubID: 0101a)

**Response:** The annual traffic volume data applied in the baseline analysis was obtained from the Virginia Department of Transportation traffic data publication.

<http://www.virginiadot.org/comtravel/ct-TrafficCounts-2003.asp>

---



### 13 Appendix 1: Record of Public Suggestions

ID	SubID	Postal Address	Organization / Group	Source	Subject Code
1	0001a	Oakton, 22124	10 Residents	Mail Petition	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
2	0002a	Vienna, 22181	9 Residents	Mail Petition	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
3	0003a	Vienna, 22182	30 Residents	Mail Petition	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
4	0004a	Oakton, 22124	3 Residents	Petition Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
5	0005a	Vienna, 22181	1 Resident	Petition Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
6	0006a	Vienna, 22182	16 Residents	Petition Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
7	0007a	Herndon, 20171	53 Residents	Petition Online	3.15 McLearen Road Extension
8	0008a	Reston, 20191	2 Residents	Petition Online	3.15 McLearen Road Extension
9	0009a	Dunn Loring, 22027		Email	3.4 Elm Place and Morgan Lane
11	0011a	Vienna, 22182	Providence District Council	Online	11.4 Plan Update Process
12	0012a	Vienna, 22182		Online	11.4 Plan Update Process
13	0013a	Oakton, 22124	Providence TAC Representative	Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
15	0015a	N/A	Sully TAC Representative	Email	3.2 Centreville Road
16	0016a	Fairfax, 22031		Online	11.4 Plan Update Process
16	0016b	Fairfax, 22031		Online	7 TDM
17	0017a	Centreville, 20121		Online	6 Environmental Impact (6.1 Noise)
17	0017b	Centreville, 20121		Online	6 Environmental Impact (6.1 Noise)
18	0018a	Herndon, 20171	Fox Mill Estates	Online	3.15 McLearen Road Extension
35	0035a	Fairfax, 22030		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	11.2 Plan Review
35	0035b	Fairfax, 22030		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	12.2 Land use
35	0035c	Fairfax, 22030		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	2 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.1 Policy Issues);
ID	SubID	Postal Address	Organization / Group	Source	Subject Code

50	0050a	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.2 Rail Extension; 1.2.2 Dulles Corridor Rail
50	0050b	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.3 Access to Rail Stations
50	0050c	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.3 Access to Rail Stations
50	0050d	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.3 Dulles Corridor
50	0050e	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.1 HOV/HOT Facilities
50	0050f	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.5 Park and Ride
50	0050g	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.3 Access to Rail Stations
50	0050h	Reston, 20190	President, Dulles Corridor Rail Association	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.3. Dulles Corridor
52	0052a	Vienna, 22124		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	9 Road Functional Classification 9.2 Local Roads
52	0052b	Vienna, 22124		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.8. Hunter Mill Road
56	0056a	Oak Hill, 20171	Sasscers Hill HOA, President	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.15 McLearen Road Extension
71	0071a	Herndon, 20171		Online	3.15 McLearen Road Extension
72	0072a	Alexandria, 22309		Online	8 Traffic Operation
72	0072b	Alexandria, 22309		Online	3.17 Old Mill Road
72	0072c	Alexandria, 22309		Online	3.17 Old Mill Road
73	0073a	Fairfax, 22030		Online: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	12.1 Bus Service Requests
73	0073b	Fairfax, 22030		Online: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	12.1 Bus Service Requests

ID	SubID	Postal Address	Organization / Group	Source	Subject Code
----	-------	----------------	----------------------	--------	--------------

74	0074a	Falls Church, 22043		Online	1.3 Access to Rail Stations
101	0101a	Alexandria, 22310		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	12.4 Traffic Data
102	0102a	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	11.3 Plan Performance Measures
102	0102b	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.1 HOV/HOT Facilities
102	0102c	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	11.1 Implementation; 12.2 Land Use
102	0102d	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	11.3 Plan Performance Measures
102	0102e	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.1 HOV/HOT Facilities
102	0102f	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	2 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.1 Policy Issues)
102	0102g	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	10 ROW Requirement Guidelines
102	0102h	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	11.3 Plan Performance Measures
102	0102i	Fairfax, 22031		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	7 TDM 11.1 Implementation
103	0103a	Alexandria, 22312		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	9.3 Cut-Through Traffic
125	0125a	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.21 Western County Roads
125	0125b	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.21 Western County Roads
125	0125c	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.21 Western County Roads
125	0125d	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.3 Access to Rail Stations
125	0125e	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.21 Western County Roads
125	0125f	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	3.21 Western County Roads
<b>ID</b>	<b>SubID</b>	<b>Postal Address</b>	<b>Organization / Group</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>
125	0125g	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	2. Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)

125	0125h	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.2 Rail Extension; 3.9. I-66
125	0125i	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	12.1 Bus Service Requests
125	0125j	Centreville, 20121		Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	7 TDM
128	0128a	Chantilly, 20151	Northern Virginia Building Industry Association	Mail	12.3 Housing Affordability
129	0129a	Annandale, 22003		Online	3.13 Little River Turnpike
130	0130a	Annandale, 22003		Online	2 Non-Motorized Transportation
130	0130b	Annandale, 22003		Online	2 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)
130	0130c	Annandale, 22003		Online	2 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)
131	0131a	Reston, 20192	USGS	Online	12.1 Bus Service Requests
132	0132b	Clifton, 20124	Centreville Citizens for Rail	Online	1.1. HOV/HOT
132	0132a	Clifton, 20124	Centreville Citizens for Rail	Online	1.2 Rail Extension; 3.9. I-66
132	0132c	Clifton, 20124	Centreville Citizens for Rail	Online	12.2 Land Use
134	0134a	Alexandria, 22306	Mount Vernon District Supervisor	Email	3.14 Lorton Road
135	0135a	Vienna, 22181		Mail	1.2 Rail Extension; (1.2.2 Dulles Corridor Rail)
135	0135b	Vienna, 22181		Mail	3.1 Bridges
135	0135c	Vienna, 22181		Mail	3.9 I-66
135	0135d	Vienna, 22181		Mail	1.4 VRE
135	0135e	Vienna, 22181		Mail	12.1 Bus Service Requests
<b>ID</b>	<b>SubID</b>	<b>Postal Address</b>	<b>Organization / Group</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>
135	0135f	Vienna, 22181		Mail	12.1 Bus Service Requests
135	0135g	Vienna, 22181		Mail	1.2 Rail Extension; 1.2.3 Light Rail and others

136	0136a	Oakton, 22124	Hunter Mill Road Traffic Calming Committee	Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
136	0136b	Oakton, 22124	Hunter Mill Road Traffic Calming Committee	Online	9 Roadway Functional Classification (9.2 Local Roads)
137	0137a	Alexandria, 22306		Online	3.11 I-495
138	0138a	Oakton, 22124	Homeowner in Hunting Hills Subdivision	Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
139	0139a	Oakton, 22124	Marbury Woods Neighbors Asso; Friends of Oakton Library	Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
139	0139b	Oakton, 22124	Marbury Woods Neighbors Asso; Friends of Oakton Library	Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
140	0140a	Centreville, 20120		Online	7 TDM
140	0140b	Centreville, 20120		Online	7 TDM
140	0140c	Centreville, 20120		Online	7 TDM
141	0141a	McLean, 22102	Sack, Harris & Martin	Mail	3.5 Greensboro Extension
143	0143a	Vienna, 22180		Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road;
167	0167a	Herndon, 20171		Online	3.2 Centreville Road
167	0167b	Herndon, 20171		Online	3.2 Centreville Road
167	0167c	Herndon, 20171		Online	3.2 Centreville Road
<b>ID</b>	<b>SubID</b>	<b>Postal Address</b>	<b>Organization / Group</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>
169	0169a	Fairfax, 22033		Online	3.9 I-66
169	0169b	Fairfax, 22033		Online	1.3 Access to Rail Stations

227	0227c	Vienna, 22182		Mail	2 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)
227	0227a	Vienna, 22182		Mail	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
227	0227b	Vienna, 22182		Mail	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
230	0230a	Herndon, 20171		Online	3.15 McLearen Road Extension
235	0235a	McLean, 22101	Dranesville District Supervisor	Mail	3.22 Wiehle Ave Extension
251	0251a	Vienna, 22182		Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
251	0251b	Vienna, 22182		Online	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
256	0256a	Herndon, 20171		Online	3.15 McLearn Road Extension
256	0256b	Herndon, 20171		Online	6 Environmental Impact (6.2 Chesapeake Bay Plan)
268	0268a	Vienna, 22182		Mail	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
269	0269a	Fairfax, 22035	Fairfax Area Commission on Aging	Online	5 Transportation for Seniors
270	0270a	Oak Hill, 20171		Online	3.15 McLearen Road Extension
271	0271a	Mason Neck, 22079	Mason Neck Citizen's Assoc.	Online	3.6 Gunston Cove Road
280	0280a	Alexandria, 22306	Mount Vernon District Supervisor	Mail	3.14 Lorton Road
285	0285a	N/A	Mount Vernon Council	Mail	9 Roadway Functional Classification
286	0286a	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.7 Hooes Road
<b>ID</b>	<b>SubID</b>	<b>Postal Address</b>	<b>Organization / Group</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>
286	0286b	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	8 Traffic Operation
286	0286c	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	9.3 Cut-Through Traffic

286	0286d	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	8 Traffic Operations
286	0286e	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.19 Silverbrook Road
286	0286f	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.6 Gunston Cove Road
286	0286g	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.6 Gunston Cove Road
286	0286h	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.7 Hooes Road
286	0286i	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.10 I-95
286	0286j	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.12 Lee Chapel Road
286	0286k	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	3.18 Pohick Road
286	0286l	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	8 Traffic Operations

<b>ID</b>	<b>SubID</b>	<b>Postal Address</b>	<b>Organization / Group</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>
286	0286m	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	8 Traffic Operations
286	0286n	N/A	South County Federation Ad Hoc Transportation Committee	Email	8 Traffic Operations
288	0288a	Burke, 22015		Email	2.3 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)

288	0288b	Burke, 22015		Email	2.3 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)
288	0288c	Burke, 22015		Email	2.3 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)
288	0288d	Burke, 22015		Email	2.3 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.3 Project Proposals)
288	0288e	Burke, 22015		Email	2 Non-Motorized Transportation (2.1 General Policy Issues)
289	0289a	Vienna, 22182		Mail	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
289	0289b	Vienna, 22182		Mail	3.8 Hunter Mill Road
289	0289c	Vienna, 22182		Mail	2.2 Non-Motorized Transportation; 3.8 Hunter Mill Road
291	0291a	Reston, 20190	Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce	Form: Mar 2005 Public Meetings	1.2 Rail Extension
292	0292a	N/A	County Non-Motorized Transportation Committee	Meetings and Emails	2.2 Suggestions from County Trails and Sidewalks Committee
312	0312a	Alexandria, 22310		Online	2 Non-Motorized Transportation
318	0318a	Herndon, 20171		Online	12.1 Bus Service Requests



<b>ID</b>	<b>SubID</b>	<b>Postal Address</b>	<b>Organization / Group</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Subject Code</b>
375	0375a	Alexandria, 22310		Mail	3.20 South Van Dorn Street
344	0344a	Vienna, 22182		Form: Nov 2005 Public Meetings	12.2 Land Use
376	0376a		Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association	Referred by Planning Commission	3.6 Gunston Cove Road
376	0376b		Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association	Referred by Planning Commission	3.10 I-95
376	0376c		Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association	Referred by Planning Commission	3.10 I-95
376	0376d		Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association	Referred by Planning Commission	3.16 Mount Vernon Roads
376	0376e		Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association	Referred by Planning Commission	3.16 Mount Vernon Roads
376	0376f		Mount Vernon Council of Citizens Association	Referred by Planning Commission	3.14 Lorton Road
377	0377		Braddock District Task Force	Referred by Board of Supervisors	4 Braddock District Task Force